FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Supplement

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-127S
Friday
1 July 1988

Soviet Union
SUPPLEMENT

FBIS-SOV-88-127 *1 July 1988*

CONTENTS

19th CPSU CONFERENCE

Further Reportage on First Day's Proceedings 1
PRAVDA Carries Gorbachev Report *[29 Jun]* 1
Bakatin Opens Debate *[IZVESTIYA 30 Jun]* 36
Motornyy Conference Speech *[PRAVDA 30 Jun]* 39
Kolbin Views Restructuring *[PRAVDA 30 Jun]* 41
Moscow Gorkom Chief Belyaninov *[PRAVDA 30 Jun]* 44
Further on 29 Jun Conference Speeches 46
Altay Kraykom's Popov Speaks *[PRAVDA 30 Jun]* 46
Arbatov Address *[PRAVDA 30 Jun]* 49
Ulyanov, Gorbachev Exchange *[PRAVDA 30 Jun]* 52
Marchuk Speech *[PRAVDA 1 Jul]* 56
Armenia's Arutyunyan Speaks *[PRAVDA 1 Jul]* 59
Sokolov Defends Restructuring 61
Sokolov Address Published *[PRAVDA 1 Jul]* 62
Gorbachev Talks With Delegates 29 Jun 64
Gorbachev 29 Jun Walkabout Described 65
Party Conference Proceedings Enter Third Day 66
30 Jun Speakers Listed 66
Postnikov, Gorbachev Exchanges *[PRAVDA 1 Jul]* 66
Gorbachev Address 30 Jun 69
PRAVDA Publishes Speech *[1 Jul]* 74
Razumovskiy, OGONEK Editor Speak *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 1 Jul]* 78
Sklyarov Sums Up Third Day 78
Duration 'Impossible' To Judge 79
Roundup of Proceedings 79
Azerbaijani Official Calls Transfer 'Unrealistic' 80
KGB Proposals at Conference Noted *[Belgrade TANJUG]* 80
Economist on 'Conflict' in Perestroyka Goals 81
Belorussian Officials Brief Press 81
Latvian Writer on Nationalities Issue 82
Delegates Stress Need for Discipline 82
Soviet General on Restructuring in Army 83
Estonian Delegates Speak to Journalists 83
Preliminary Reports on Conference Fourth Day 83
Gromyko Chairs Morning Session 83
Backstage Talk Reported *[PRAVDA 1 Jul]* 84
'Final Session' in Progress 86
Estonian Program for CPSU Conference *[Tallinn RAHUA HAAL 18 Jun]* 86
PRAVDA's Zhmirev on Restructuring *[Sofia POGLED 27, 28 Jun]* 89
Gorbachev Speech To Be Published as Book 89
Delegate Wants 'Abolishment of Censorship' *[MOSCOW NEWS No 25]* 89

Further Reportage on First Day's Proceedings

PRAVDA Carries Gorbachev Report

PM2906103188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
29 Jun 88 Second Edition pp 2-7

["On the Course of the Implementation of the 27th CPSU Congress Decisions and Tasks in Deepening Restructuring. Report by M.S. Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference on 28 June 1988"—PRAVDA headline]

[Text] Comrade delegates! How to deepen the revolutionary restructuring that has been launched in our country on the initiative and under the guidance of the party, and make it irreversible—that is the fundamental issue facing us, the delegates to the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference. This question is posed by life itself. It is being discussed broadly in the party and among the people, and on how correct an answer we give depends whether the party is in a position to fulfill the role of political vanguard at the new stage of the development of Soviet society. One can quite justifiably call the last 3 years of our lives a turnaround. It has been possible, by the efforts of the party and the working people, to stop the slide toward crisis in the economic, social, and spiritual spheres. Society now knows and understands better its past, present, and future. The policy of restructuring, developed in specific socioeconomic programs, is becoming the practical cause of millions. This is the essence of the political situation in the country.

We can see how society has become enlivened. The country's spiritual life has become more varied, more interesting, and richer. Many of the ideas of Karl Marx and Vladimir Ilich Lenin, which until recently were either taken in a one-sided way or were passed over completely in silence, have been getting new readings. In the struggle against dogmatism the creative principle of scientific, humanistic socialism is being reborn. People have started to feel their own responsibility; they are breaking free of apathy and alienation. The wind of renewal is tempering the people's moral health. Democratization has freed a powerful stream of thoughts, emotions, and initiatives. The assertion of truth and glasnost is purifying the atmosphere in society, is inspiring people, unfettering their consciousness, and stimulating active work.

It is, comrades, a brilliant and impressive process in which all that is honest and progressive in our people is involved. The forces of revolutionary renewal are being consolidated. People have come to believe in restructuring and demand an unfaltering advance—and only an advance. The working class is demonstrating a lofty consciousness and level of organization. In the process of the unusual, new, and complex developments invading our life, it is once again demonstrating its fine political and moral qualities, exhibiting a truly civic and statesman-like approach to matters, and expressing support for restructuring through its labor.

This stance by the working class enables the party to confidently carry out revolutionary transformations. The peasantry has responded with great commitment. The congress of kolkhoz workers has proved what a powerful restructuring energy it possesses. The champions of restructuring in agriculture are boldly undertaking new forms of work, arming themselves with science and efficient technology, demonstrating a readiness to experiment, search, even take risks on behalf of the new cause, and to exert themselves fully in working responsibly and skillfully for themselves and for the good of the fatherland.

Restructuring has confirmed Lenin's well-known tenet on the intelligentsia's heightened social sensitivity and its responsiveness to social change. It has responded fervently to the party's appeals to place society's intellectual and spiritual potential fully at the service of restructuring. The intelligentsia gave sincere support to the lesson of truth given by the 27th CPSU Congress. Party decisions over the last 3 years have met with deep understanding among it. And so, the main political result of the post-April period has been a change in the whole atmosphere, in society, a start of the materialization of the idea of renewal, and growing support by the Soviet people for the party's course of restructuring.

However, does this mean that changes for the better are taking place everywhere and at full speed, that revolutionary transformations have become irreversible? No, it does not. If we wish to remain grounded in reality, we have to admit that so far this has not taken place, comrades. We have not yet overcome the profound causes of the braking process, and the mechanisms of renewal have not been brought in everywhere nor have some things been worked out completely. The capacity for action by many party organizations does not match the tasks of restructuring. New qualitative changes are needed in our development and this calls for fundamental decisions and for vigorous and innovative actions.

Today we are faced with many complex issues, but which of them is the key one? The CPSU Central Committee believes that the reform of our political system is such an issue. The Central Committee has set out its platform in the theses for the conference. The task was not posed there of ready answers to everything. We calculated that new ideas and proposals that can be taken into account by the conference will arise in the course of discussion and that its decision will then be really the result of the collective creativity of the whole party and people. Thus, the political aim of our conference is to interpret the period after the April Plenum of the Central Committee and the 27th party congress in a comprehensive and critical manner, to enrich the strategy and to express in concrete terms the tactics of our transformations, and to define the ways, forms, and methods of work that will

guarantee the steadfast development and the irreversibility of restructuring, in the spirit of Leninist traditions and relying on our accumulated experience.

I. Developing and Deepening Restructuring [section subhead]

1. Assessing What Has Been Achieved Self-Critically [subhead]

Comrades, the process of revolutionary renewal is increasingly profoundly penetrating the deciding sphere of life and the economy. We have set about the profound reform, truly radical in its aims and scale, of the system of managing the national economy. A considerable proportion of the economy's primary units are assimilating the principles of complete financial autonomy and self-financing in accordance with the Law on the State Enterprise. The law which was recently adopted on cooperatives in the USSR opens up a path toward establishing a major cooperative sector in the country's economy and toward the broad application of various cooperative forms in all spheres of the national economy. Restructuring of labour and internal production relations has begun on the basis of contracting and leasing. This makes it possible to unite the advantage of public property with the personal interest of a person and his caring attitude to the matter in hand and civic self-assertion.

Noticeable impetus has been given to developing individual labor activity. Several major decisions of a fundamental nature have been made that have determined directions for restructuring for the basic branches of the national economy and the social sphere, which are being implemented.

The economy is gradually gaining momentum. Last year for the first time overall growth in national income was achieved by raising labor productivity. There has been a renewal in the growth of the working people's real income. In the first 2 years of the current 5-year plan real income calculated per head of population has increased by 4.6 percent. By comparison with the 11th 5-Year Plan annual construction of housing has increased by 15 million square meters. We have seriously set about reorganizing public education and the health service. The birth rate has risen and the death rate has fallen, and that is to no mean degree connected with the campaign against drunkenness and alcoholism. The tendency toward improving the social and economic situation has also developed this year. National income is increasing more rapidly than envisaged by the plan with an absolute reduction in the number of people employed in material production. Production of consumer goods is increasing at a very fast pace, and that has made it possible to fulfill the 5-month task for the volume of trade turnover.

A total of 5.9 percent more food and nonfood products have been sold than in the same period last year. The volume of consumer services to the people has increased by 13.5 percent. The construction of housing and social and consumer facilities has been accelerated; 6 percent more apartments and houses, 22 percent more general schools, nearly one third more preschool institutions, clubs, and houses of culture, and twice as many hospitals have been built.

All this is the real fruit of restructuring. However, comrades, we are obliged to be self-critical and to see clearly that despite all the positive elements the state of affairs in the economy is slow in changing, especially if we judge by the final result, by the peoples' standard of living.

What are the reasons for this? It must be said frankly, comrades: We underestimated the whole depth and weight of the deformations and of the past years' stagnation. There was a lot we simply didn't know and are seeing only now. It turned out that the neglect of affairs in different spheres of the economy was more serious than we had first thought.

Just how serious the situation is can be seen in particular in the country's financial situation. For many years the outgoings of the state budget went faster than its income. The budget deficit applies pressure on the market, undermines the stability of the ruble and money circulation, and gives birth to inflationary processes. Yet I think that in speaking of the mistakes and the bitter lessons of the past we must be no less exacting and no less principled in our attitude to ourselves and the present time than we are to our predecessors. We must analyze not only our successes but also our mistakes, the lessons of our activity over the past 3 years, and the mistakes and blunders made during restructuring. From this viewpooint, it must be said self-critically: Over 3 years we could have done much more than was done in the main sectors of restructuring, first and foremost in raising the efficiency of our economy and improving its final results. It is a fact that even today the country continues to use too much fuel energy, electric power, and metal per unit of national income. This is why there is a shortage of resources despite the great volume of them produced, which obliges us to allocate more and more money to increase the raw material, fuel, and energy base. In order to break out of this vicious circle we have embarked on a radical modernization of Soviet mechanical engineering as the decisive condition for accelerating scientific and technical progress and for reconstructing our entire national economy. I can say that this is an unprecendented program. It demands extraordinary efforts, not only in mechanical engineering itself, but in the chemical industry, metallurgy, and other industries, and of course in the sphere of scientific research and development.

Work has started on this, but it is not yet on a level with the scale of the tasks that have been set. It is going slowly, especially in such vanguard spheres as microelectronincs, computer technology, and the creation of advanced materials. Direct responsibility for this is

borne by the Buro of the USSR Council of Ministers for machine-building, the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology, and the leading industry cadres.

Structural advances in the economy are going slowly on the whole. This means that it still has most of the problems that have accumulated in the past. But this is also a reflection of today's approaches to economic management.

And another thing: the June Plenum of the Central Committee, as you will recall, spoke of the need to combine the achievement of long-term strategic aims with the maximum satisfaction of the vital needs of the people. Structural restructuring and radical economic reform are fundamental processes. They will require time, great efforts, and resources. In implementing these tasks, we must at the same time without delay also address the pressing problems of raising the people's well-being. This line stems wholly from the directives of the 27th CPSU Congress aimed at intensifying the social orientation of our development.

How are these tasks being addressed? I will begin with the food problem, as this is perhaps the sorest point in the life of society, the most acute problem. There are certain improvements here, but they cannot satisfy us. In essence, the increase in the food supply that we have attained has to a substantial extent gone to covering needs connected with population growth. And this means, comrades, that we need a different, higher pace of increasing food resources. We have neither a moral nor political right to accept a protracted resolution of the food problem.

A fair question arises: Why have we not been succeeding for so long in making any headway in this? Certainly, many causes trace their roots back into the past, when the foundations of the rural economy's development were seriously undermined. But this in no way justifies the current neglect in agriculture. It would appear that all the knots have been untied, the kolkhozes and sovkhozes, the rayons, the oblasts, the republics, have been granted the most wide-ranging rights for increasing production of crop and livestock output, but the desired result is still lacking.

More than that, many decisions of the recent period are coming up against incomprehension and procrastination in their implementation, against all manner of bureaucratic obstacles, and simply even reluctance to work in the new way. The correctness of that conclusion is confirmed by the differences in the results of the work of many regions, even with equal natural and economic conditions. Where they have come to grips with the job energetically, where they are really using the new possibilities, the situation is noticeably improving. Take for example Belorussia, Lithuania, Altay Kray, and Belgorod, Volgograd, Zhitomir, Lipetsk, Orel, Khmelnitskiy, and Tselinograd Oblasts. The production of livestock products is steadily rising there, which has made it possible to noticeably improve the provision of foodstuffs.

But how is it they managed to improve the provision of food to the population in Belgorod Oblast, and they didn't manage it in neighboring Kursk Oblast? How is it that the farm workers in Tselinograd Oblast increased supplies of meat, milk, and vegetables to the trade network, and yet in North Kazakhstan and certain other neighboring oblasts they didn't manage to do it? Such examples, comrades, occur, as they say, pretty often.

More than that, Vologda, Kaliningrad, Kirovograd, Kurgan, and Yaroslavl Oblasts, and the Kalmyk Autonomous Republic have even permitted a reduction in the production of many agricultural products. Stagnant phenomena still persist in the agriculture of Uzbekistan, Moldavia, and the Transcaucasian republics. And so much lies in the attitude to the job, in the competence of the leadership, in their ability to run the economy in the new way. I think the quest for ways of improving the job of food supply has to be continued in all places, and primarily in those oblasts and republics where the situation is not changing, or is improving slowly. And, moreover, this has to be done throughout the nation, on the basis of a profound analysis of the state of agriculture. What should attention be focused upon?

Experience shows that the shortest and most reliable path to a sufficiency in foodstuffs is to introduce broad, general leasing and other effective methods of organizing and stimulating labor. This is a key section of the present-day agrarian policy. The results of work done by collectives working on leasing and contracting have demonstrated that, over a relatively short period, the level of crop yield and livestock productivity can be rapidly increased, labor productivity can be substantially raised, losses can be curtailed, and good-quality output produced. It is precisely in this experience, comrades, that provides the answer to the major question of how long it will take the country to resolve the foodstuffs problem.

Everything depends on how quickly we get people interested and set up the work of leased and sub-contracting collectives, how broadly we involve rural workers in this process, and make the peasant the genuine master of the land. It goes without saying that we must, at the same time, pursue the course to strengthen the material-technical base of agriculture and the food industry. Measures for improving the transportation, storage, and processing of agricultural produce are of an urgent nature. If we manage to reap, transport, store, and process the harvest in time, and deliver the goods to the customer in good time, then even at the present level of productivity of fields and farms it will be possible to increase the consumption of food products by 20-30 percent. This obvious reserve must be used.

We have worked out a specific program for improving the processing, storage, and transportation of agricultural products and we have allocated R77 billion for these purposes in the remaining years of the 12th and for the 13th 5-year period. Now we must organize affairs ably and make efficient use of these resources so that we can decisively correct the situation in a short time. The broad development of the cooperative movement, the introduction of financial autonomy and leased contracting, as well as other progressive methods of organizing and stimulating labor, objectively require radical changes in the management of the agro-industrial complex.

Practice has shown that, in their present form, agro-industrial bodies in rayons and oblasts are making themselves redundant. It seems one must follow the path prompted by life, upon which, following the example of Tula grain-growers, many rayons, oblasts, and republics have already embarked. And I am talking about the voluntary union of kolkhozes and sovkhozes for the creation of joint services and management bodies.

Agricultural workers are better judges of what forms of management and services organizations they need. As far as soviet and party organs are concerned, their task lies in lending assistance and support to farms in restructuring in rural areas, in radically changing methods of management. As for those workers who are holding things up and standing in the way of new developments, as was already stated at the kolkhoz farmers congress, they must be decisively removed.

And another important problem—no matter what resources we direct at agriculture, they will not give the necessary return unless we concern ourselves with the individual, with the conditions of his labor and daily life. I would like to speak in particular about the social development of rural areas. Here, society has no small debt to the rural dwellers. Housing and social and cultural conditions, as well as the medical care provided in villages, are at a low level in many rayons.

To this one must add the unsatisfactory way in which houses in the countryside are fitted out; difficulties with electricity supplies and the use of domestic equipment; and the poor condition of roads.

During the present 5-year plan, more major measures than ever before are being undertaken toward improving the social sphere in the countryside. A major program of transformation is being implemented in particular in that most important region of the country, the Russian non-Chernozem zone. Workers in the countryside should, in the coming years, already feel everywhere real changes in living and working conditions. This line must continue to be consistently carried out in the future. Gosplan and the USSR State Agro-Industrial Committee should proceed from this when preparing the plan for the 13th 5-Year Plan.

In a word, comrades, the essence of agrarian policy at the present stage amounts to insuring a change in the production relationship in the countryside itself. We must restore the economic balance between town and village, disclose in all ways the potential of kolkhozes and sovkhozes through the development of various forms of contracting and leasing, overcome the alienation of the peasant from the land and make him the sole master and protect him against any commanding, cardinal change in the living conditions of rural workers. Only on this basis can the effectiveness of agro-industrial production be sharply increased and a radical improvement in the food supply within the country be ensured.

On the housing problem. We have begun to solve a task of exceptional importance, to provide practically every family with a separate apartment or an individual house by the year 2000. As we know, in order to do this, over 35 million apartments and houses have to be built. Although the situation in housing construction has begun to change for the better, it remains very tense, and people are waiting years for an apartment. We have set about unusual solutions in this regard. We have considerably increased the scale of the erection of new houses and flats at the expense of state resources, by reducing capital investment on industrial construction, and of the funds of labor collectives that have gone over to financial autonomy. Practical measures have been taken to develop cooperative and individual housing construction. Their essence lies in meeting the desires of people to provide themselves with a cooperative apartment or a home of their own.

To this end, all bans and limitations on the dimensions of buildings and their number of floors have been removed. Let people put up what they need, with their labor resources, taking into consideration present and future requirements. The numerous proposals to provide citizens with the opportunity to buy from the state the apartments they occupy, with the right to pass them on by inheritance, are thought to be well-founded.

The decision adopted to speed up the construction of housing has evoked the approval of the Soviet people. Everywhere things have begun to change for the better, but new problems are arising. The level of development of the base of construction organizations and the construction materials industry is not in keeping with growing demand. Here a great deal needs to be done, taking advantage of all the possibilities available in the oblasts, krays, and republics. Much depends on the machine-builders who are obliged to supply the most modern machines and equipment to the builders and the enterprises of the construction materials industry. All this needs to be resolved urgently and in a businesslike manner.

And finally about satisfying the demand for consumer goods and developing the trade and service sphere—the changes that have taken shape here do not eradicate the

main problems. The supply of goods and services continues to lag behind the growth in purchasing power of the population, something which is to no small extent caused by neglect of this sphere and by the attitude toward it. Much depends on the operation of light industry. Today we are, as they say, reaping the fruits of the protracted disregard for the development of this sector. Obsolete equipment is being used at its enterprises. A great deal of the heavy work is being done manually. All this has an effect on productivity, the quantity and quality of output, and cadre stability. Now measures have been adopted that are called upon to correct the situation here. Large amounts of money have been allocated. The enterprises are being modernized, using both Soviet and imported equipment.

But there are other reasons as well. The slow intensification of consumer goods production can largely be explained by our badly arranged economic mechanism and by the poor incentives. Most of the union ministries enterprises and departments that are called upon to provide the market with consumer durables regard this as a secondary task. They are using all kinds of pretexts in an attempt to get out of tackling it. We are faced with the task of creating a modern and mighty industry to produce consumer goods. This not only applies to light industry but the defense factories and heavy industry enterprises whose contribution to the production and supply of consumer goods should be decisively increased.

This is not just a question of quantitative but of qualitative indicators as well. Special responsibility for the provision of goods and services lies with the local bodies. In the republics and oblasts there are quite a few examples of real initiative and enterprise, and in saturating the market with goods by exploiting local potential.

All the same, in many regions the free-ride mentality is too strong, as are attempts to wheedle funds even for those goods that could perfectly well be produced locally. Such a stance is unforgiveable, now that broad-ranging opportunities have opened up for developing cooperative and individual labor activity. In those places where this was understood in good time and the necessary conditions set up, the results are obvious: new goods and types of services are emerging as a result and this can only be welcomed. In brief, attitudes to this matter, which affects the people's vital interests, should be fundamentally altered both at the center and at local level.

2. Consistently Implementing Radical Economic Reform [subhead]

Comrades, in reviewing the progress of restructuring, the issue of how the radical economic reform is being implemented needs to be singled out in particular. The transfer of enterprises to financial autonomy, and to self-financing and self-management, is giving collectives a chance to get a real feel both for their new rights and the difficult burden of responsibility. While the reform is taking only its first steps and the new economic management methods are only being mastered, they are already beginning to have a positive effect on the solution to many production and social problems and on the atmosphere as a whole within the collectives.

This year, the enterprises working in the new way have not only ensured that the plan for production output was met, but have also significantly improved their economic indicators. This is highly noteworthy.

However, today, the main thing is to draw lessons from the difficulties of the initial stage of the reform. Practice has revealed problems leading to the new economic mechanism marking time. To a certain extent these are linked to the fact that not all its elements have yet been introduced and that we began to implement the reform, as they say, on the move, during the 5-year plan, under conditions when the structural positions of the plan were already determined and when obsolete prices and the old centralized methods of distributing resources were being preserved. This goes to explain a great deal—a great deal but far from everything.

The difficulties that have arisen have been generated to a great extent by the tenacity of the stereotypes of economic management, the desire to preserve the primary command-administrative methods of running the economy, and resistance to the new on the part of some of the management staff. In a number of cases we are coming up against direct attempts to distort the essence of the reform, and to fill new forms of management with the old content. Deviations from the letter and spirit of the law on the enterprise, because of which it is not being implemented to the full, as many economic planners admit, are being allowed quite often by ministries and departments. The experience of working out enterprise plans for this year, when the old system of binding targets for production volume was effectively preserved under the guise of the state orders, tells us about this.

This is nothing but the result of arbitrariness by ministries where the proper control is missing, or with the connivance of Gosplan and the standing bodies of the USSR Council of Ministers. It is quite unacceptable for enterprises to be ordered by the state to produce output that is not in demand by consumers. They are forced to do it simply in order to achieve the notorious "gross output." This diktat was given even in regard to large collectives like Uralmash, Altayselmash, the Kurgan Wheeled Tractor Works, the Baku Tire Works, not to mention a mass of medium and small enterprises. How many people there are here who are faithful servants of His Majesty "Gross Output"!

Is there any need to prove that this fundamentally contradicts the meaning of the reform and is the same as preserving those management methods that led our economy into a dead end? It would seem that it must be clear to all now that there is not and will not be any

return to the former ways. Nevertheless, you sometimes hear the opinion even now that if "pressure" is not applied on an enterprise with a plan, it will allegedly not attempt to improve its economic indices. At first glance, it might seem that there is some sort of justification for these views. However, real life says something else. I will cite just one instance in this connection. Many people were worried that expanding the rights of enterprises, that narrowing the circle of directive indices would lead to a lowering of plan indices and a need to reconsider the tasks of the 5-year plan.

Indeed, the sum of the plans for profit adopted for this year by industrial enterprises which have gone over to complete financial autonomy, turned out to be R4.5 billion lower than the control figures. Several zealous aficionados of the old methods rubbed their hands with a certain amount of schadenfreude: This, they said, is what the desire to depend only on economic levers and stimuli leads to. But how did things work out in practice? This is how: in 5 months of this year these enterprises overfulfilled their plans for profit by R2.5 billion. And the increment among labor collectives working in complete financial autonomy amounted to 12.8 percent as against 10.2 percent at enterprises functioning in the old way. Here it is important that the increase in profit was achieved mainly thanks to lowering the production cost and reducing expenditure on materials.

I will say outright that the recent results of this for our economy have been very unusual. It deserves to be thought over attentively and comprehensively. What can be said on this subject? Obviously effective stimuli have not yet been created in the economic mechanism for enterprises to take on higher plan tasks. We need to think about this. But in the final analysis, what is important to us, comrades, is the end result. If the economic mechanism has started to work and is ensuring an improvement in real results, then that is exactly what is needed.

It is an instructive lesson. It should finally prompt the planning organs to decisively reconsider their approach to planning, to transfer the center of gravity from exerting "pressure through the plan" to economic levers and stimuli.

Experience shows, comrades, that the progress of economic reform requires constant attention from the CPSU Central Committee and the government. It must be acknowledged that they uncovered distortion of the idea of the state order only belatedly. The signals coming in were not appreciated in time nor as they should have been. This error is now being corrected. Government decisions will be adopted very soon on procedures for using state orders.

Also at the center of attention for the working collectives and management bodies in the initial stage of reform were issues concerning the formation of economic norms. Here too there were attempts by ministries and departments to retain dictatorial methods regarding enterprises. Many ministries tried to establish norms by which they could retain the possibility of redistributing means from enterprises working well to benefit inefficient ones. No doubt today, taking into account the different starting potential of the working collectives moving onto the road of financial autonomy and self-recouping, such a redistribution can, to a degree, be explained but the main tasks of norms lies elsehwere: to provide a direct link between income and final results in such a way that any improvement in the collective's work is encouraged by an increase in its income.

We cannot tolerate any open or concealed forms of the free-ride mentality or the possibility of living quite well while working badly. You know, comrades, the practice of levelling-off has a very strong grip on our psychology and economic practice. Chase it out the door, as they say, and it will come in through the window. We meet this same problem in the wage reform. The initial results of this seem to be promising. In collectives that have transferred to the new conditions, labor productivity has gone up and payment for it has increased. However, here, too, levelling is persisting. An enterprise gains the right of suitably rewarding good workers and lowering the wages of idlers, poor workers, and loafers. Nonetheless, this rule is being used timidly and according to the principle of not offending anyone. In the activity of labor collectives we have not yet overcome approaches inherited from the period of stagnation, whereby workers, technicians, and engineers, who set an example of creative, highly efficient and, on occasion, unique work have had artificially restricted wages.

Certain normative documents about this also deserve a critical attitude. Surely it is not still necessary to prove that the most efficient way of eradicating leveling tendencies is consistent implementation of the principles of financial autonomy, not just in the activity of the working collectives but in all subdivisions and in every job. Putting it simply: Reform will not get off the ground or give the results we are banking on unless the personal interests of literally every worker are profoundly affected and unless it becomes a vital concern for him. One of the main directions of the radical economic reform is the broad development of the cooperative movement. These issues were fairly thoroughly discussed at the congress of kolkhoz workers and at the Supreme Soviet session that endorsed the Law on the Cooperative System.

Thus, we have basically completed the creation of the necessary prerequisites for its comprehensive development. The Central Committee uses as its starting point the fact that the rise of the cooperative movement opens up broad opportunities for resolving many vitally important problems of society. We have given the development of the cooperative movement the same significance and the same role as Vladimir Ilich Lenin assigned to it. The center of gravity is now shifting to the area of practical matters, and it is the straightforward duty of the local soviets and the party organizations to support

in every possible way the aspiration of the working people to make an increasing contribution to the cause of restructuring on the basis of the cooperative movement.

Comrades, the economic reform would be implemented considerably better if conservatism were not so tenacious within the management apparatus. Command and administrative methods are obstinately clinging on to their positions. During the practical implementation of reform we have a real sense of the opposing forces of inertia and that sometimes leads to the adopting of halfhearted, compromise, and sometimes mistaken decisions. It is indeed a fact, comrades, that under the guise of creating state production enterprises an attempt was made to revive the system of the former bureaucratic ministerial central administrations. Thus, it was intended to substitute the idea of the voluntary association of independent enterprises with rigidly centralized organization, while preserving departmental barriers and inflated management apparatus.

Both in the center and in the localities there are quite a few such workers who will not accept the new forms of management, the conditions of democratization, and economic reform. This manifested itself also during the reduction of the management apparatus of union and republican ministries and departments and oblast and kray level management bodies.

What must be said about this? For us this is a matter of principle. We must firmly conduct the line of reducing numbers and cost of the apparatus, and raising the efficiency of its work. At the same time we must make sure that the people being released from their jobs as a result of these measures do not settle in other offices, but go into production, the service sector, cooperatives, commerce, municipal services, the places where there is a real staff shortage. We see that even a brief analysis of the processes connected with the start of reform shows what a difficult matter this is, and what great undiluted attention it demands.

Yes, there are difficulties. They are not ruled out in the future either. But reform embraces increasingly wide spheres of the economy and is demonstrating its vitality. Taking into consideration the experience which has been accumulated, we must carefully prepare for completing the transition of all enterprises in the material production sphere to the new economic conditions as of the start of 1989. That is a very serious matter. There is nothing trivial about it, for the reform will touch more and more millions of working people.

The biggest mistake in the past, which we must in no way repeat is office-based preparation of enterprises for work in the new conditions. It is indeed in those places were the working people and the councils of labor collectives have remained apart from the implementation of reform, where everything has been decided in secret from above, that the most serious blunders have been discovered and that many unforeseen difficulties have arisen. And that has been reflected in the social well-being of people and their attitude to reform.

The experience of this year has confirmed our understanding of the need to accelerate the transition to wholesale trade in means of production. What are we observing today? For those who have switched to financial autonomy and self-financing, wholesale trade is not only desireable but also vitally necessary. From the start of next year all enterprises in the sphere of material production will work in financial autonomy, so that we must obviously adopt a new approach to dates for switching to wholesale trade in means of production in order not to drag this out over many years but to complete it within the framework of the current 5-year plan.

I think that both the USSR Gosplan and Gossnab will table concrete proposals on this account. Of course, much now rests on the reform of price formation. By this I mean the review of wholesale, procurement, and retail prices and rates. The fact that this problem is unsolved is greatly complicating the implementation of economic reform. Without price reform, we will not be able to create normal economic relations in the national economy, ensure a well-founded evaluation of the costs and results of production and equivalence in the exchange of goods and services, stimulate scientific and technical progress and savings of resources, normalize the situation in the marketplace, and implement a just distribution according to labor.

For instance, how can the economy be economically run when prices for raw materials and fuel are artificially reduced? This simply must not be done. Or another question: While receiving high profits on one group of goods, at the same time the state is forced to pay out tens of billions of rubles in subsidies from the budget on another group of goods. At the same time, it is well known that both low subsidized prices and unjustifiably high prices do not stimulate growth in production and have an extremely negative effect on scientific and technological progress. It should also be stressed that reforming price formation will not in itself improve the economic situation if the questions of financial balance, of imposing order in the credit financing system, in banking activity, in the budget, and so on are not resolved at the same time. Therefore, reforming price formation should be closely linked with implementing the program for financially improving the national economy. This, in its turn, is linked to the financial situation in every enterprise and with the work of every working collective; this, too, must not be forgotten.

The reform of price formation cannot fail to affect retail prices too, since these are closely linked to the entire price system. Retail prices for many foodstuffs, and particularly meat and milk, are considerably lower today than the real outlay on their production and their procurement prices. The state is forced to make up this

difference in the form of subsidies to the consumer. Such a situation is not a normal one. It undermines incentives to produce these goods and gives rise to thriftlessness toward them, and particularly toward bread. Comrades, we are aware of all this and it is therefore simply essential that we deal with this task, however difficult it might be and whatever doubts and fears it might arouse at first sight. The issue of retail prices is now being worked out in a serious manner. Proposals on this will be put to comprehensive discussion by the people. There should be one approach here: Changes in retail prices should in no way be accompanied by a drop in people's standard of living. The issue is posed in this way: The finances currently paid out by the state in the form of subsidies will be given to the population in full in the form of compensation.

Thus, the state will obtain no direct financial gain from revising retail prices and the public will lose nothing. What we are talking about is creating a healthier situation in the national economy and more favorable conditions for the action of economic levers and incentives; for increasing production and enhancing quality of output; for saturating the market as quickly as possible with food products. In the framework of restructuring, and taking into account the implementation of radical economic reform, much work has been done on reinterpreting external economic policy. Here, too, the need has been felt for fundamentally new approaches which enable us to make better use of the advantages of the international divison of labor. The enterprises and associations now have open to them possibilities of broad access to the external market, of establishing direct external economic links and of setting up joint enterprises. As before, we are giving priority to relations with socialist countries. Together with our friends, on a bilateral and multilateral basis, we are tackling the accomplishment of the key tasks of scientific-technical progress and of the development of modern forms of economic cooperation within CEMA. We see long-term prospects in the transition to free convertibility of the ruble and in the shaping of a single socialist market. We will also try to expand external economic links with the capitalist and developing countries on a basis of mutual benefit. Here too, a course has been set toward deep integrated cooperation in science, technology, and production, based on various forms of international coproduction and specialization.

Comrades, in summing up the initial results of economic reform, we must think not only of how to fulfill the current 5-year plan. It is of fundamental importance to make use of the lessons of the first years of restructuring in order to work out a strategy for the future and above all for the 13th 5-Year Plan. In the Central Committee and in the government, the common view is forming that in the concept of the 13th 5-Year Plan and the country's subsequent development, the line of the April Central Committee Plenum and the 27th CPSU Congress toward the social reorientation of our economy must be thoroughly and steadily pursued.

That means above all, satisfying people's requirements for fully adequate food products; saturating the market with consumer goods and services in the required range and of high quality; carrying out housing construction programs; improving public health, education, and culture. Among the priority tasks is stepping up efforts to protect the natural environment and radically improve the country's ecological situation. Only with such an approach can we settle the debts remaining from the period of stagnation and steer our economy onto the lines of healthy development in the interests of the people.

The social reorientation of economic development and increasing of the proportion of consumption in the national income must become the pivot of our entire structural and investment policy and the keystone for shaping the pace and proportions of the economy.

Today it is clear that profound changes are needed, taking in the national economy as a whole, beginning with the services sphere and ending with heavy industry and the defense industry. The CPSU Central Committee is counting on the conference supporting such changes. In connection with this one ought to discuss another matter. This concerns the criteria and indicators of economic development. It is not for the first time that we are saying that rates of growth in themselves are not important, but it is fulfilling them in real terms, really satisfying the needs of the people. What is the sense of an increase in the output from raw material production, and fuel and power generating industries if it is "eaten up" by irrational and wasteful use of resources? Or who needs an increase in the output of agricultural machines if they are not bought because of their poor efficiency? And light industry does not need "gross output," nor volume of production in itself, but the kind of goods selection that would meet the people's real demand.

We still cannot renounce the old approaches. We do not need simply millions of tonnes of steel, millions of tonnes of cement, millions of tonnes of coal; we need specific end results. How long must we go round in a vicious circle of hopelessly obsolete ideas and formulas—"production for the sake of production" and "the plan for the sake of the plan"?

It is essential for the State Planning Committee and the USSR Academy of Sciences to draw up proposals on this matter which could be used as the basis of planning and the assessment of the results of economic development as early as the 13th 5-Year Plan.

Such, comrades, are some of the results of our work in the socio-economic sphere; such are the contradictions and problems of the initial phase of radical economic reforms; such are some thoughts for the immediate and more distant future.

3. Activating Society's Intellectual and Spiritual Potential [subhead]

Comrades, restructuring, the renewal of socialism, are inconceivable without invigorating in every possible way the intellectual and spiritual potential of society contained in science, education, and culture. However this statement on its own means very little. One has to act, and act vigorously and on a large scale, taking into account the fact that huge worldwide efforts are being concentrated precisely in this direction, and that the flow of capital investment to this is increasing appreciably. At the very beginning of restructuring the task was submitted of drastically changing the priorities, raising the role of the spiritual sphere, and overcoming the way it had been undervalued. A lot has changed here. A new sociopolitical atmosphere has arisen of openness, freedom, creativity, and discussion, an objective and unbiased analysis, criticism and self-criticism. A genuine revolution of consciousness is going on without which the creation of new life is impossible.

The party attaches great importance to our scientists' contribution to restructuring. The Central Committee Theses stress that at the basis of the party's economic and social strategy is the acceleration of scientific and technical progress, primarily mastering the achievements of its present-day stage connected with the development of the vanguard technologies—microelectronics, robot technology, information science, biotechnology, and so on.

Positive changes have taken place in the development of science and technology, the demands on the technical standards of production have been raised, and the timeframe for the assimilation of scientific research organizations' studies has been reduced. Major measures have been adopted to change the system of planning, financing, and material provision for research and development, for accelerated utilization of scientific achievements in practice, and for stimulating scientific work. These measures have had a positive influence, but so far we have still not managed to change the situation radically. This situation has proved to be particularly complicated in basic research, which determines the prospects for science and scientific-technological progress.

As before, there is the effect of many impeding factors inherited from the time of the domination of command-administrative methods of management, when science often had imposed on it areas of research which did not stem from the logic of its own development, and, on the contrary, many new and promising areas of research did not receive timely support or were even prohibited. The way that a number of well-grounded goals were set did not provide for them materially or organizationally, and this compromised scientific policy as a whole. Science was not included to the necessary degree in the nationwide planning system as an integral component, without which the development and implementation of socioeconomic policy in the broadest sense of that word is not possible. Scientists were rarely brought in to give expert opinions on projects, decisions, and plans, and their opinion, if it diverged from the interests of departments, was ignored and sometimes even persecuted.

As a result, the social status of science and the prestige of scientific work have clearly declined in recent decades. The most disturbing thing is that in the years of stagnation, Soviet science fell behind in a number of leading areas, scientific development became predominantly an attempt to "catch up." It is an abnormal circumstance that only 6.8 percent of all the funds allocated for scientific research go to the academic sector of science, which carries out the bulk of basic research. That is why it is today insufficient merely to rectify all these mistakes and omissions in science policy; the matter concerns a profound restructuring, the breaking up of many structures of the economic mechanism that have become fixed, and the improvement of the internal relationships within science itself.

We must create a qualitatively new Soviet scientific potential, without which it is not possible to achieve a breakthrough in basic research on a short timescale, and on this basis successfully implement the whole set of planned programs for the socio-economic restructuring of our society. Decisive measures are required in further improving the management of scientific-technological progress and in overcoming departmental barriers. One way is the formation of intersectoral scientific-technological complexes, engineering centers and ad hoc collectives for acomplishing targeted tasks. Also of much importance is the organic involvement of scientific organizations in the system of financial autonomy relations, which has begun, and the creation of a complete cycle of scientific research, technology and techniques, investment, production, marketing, and service.

It is clear that the potential of basic and applied science is accumulated over years and decades; however, factors also exist for accelerating scientific development. These are, above all, democratizing the atmosphere of science and overcoming bureaucratism, guidance by administrative order, conservatism, and monopolism. It is necessary to open up scope for the greatest possible manifestation of talent, creative initiative, self-management, rivalry on the basis of equal rights, and competition between scientific ideas and opinions. A number of scientists are also posing the question of expediency in diversifying the methods of organizing science and of adopting a sensible combination of state and cooperative forms.

The development of social sciences requires particular attention. It is precisely they which suffered most from the personality cult, from bureaucratic management methods, dogmatism, and incompetent interference. As we know, a noticeable revival in social science research occurred after the 20th CPSU Congress and new scientific areas and new cadres of scientists capable of conducting affairs in a new style appeared. However, self-willed approaches to the formulation of the tasks of

thought in social sciences and dogmatic methods of solving them soon began to pick up again. An acute social need for research in social sciences has arisen within conditions for restructuring. We need a genuine upturn in social sciences on a Marxist-Leninist philosophical and methodological basis. There is a need for objective scientific research on such problems of restructuring as the economic reform and the reconstruction of the political system, democratization, humanist renewal, relations between nations, the new political thinking, and much else. In other words, society, which is proceeding toward its qualitatively new condition, needs an integral concept for development, a view of the dialectics of the processes and contradictory nature of their reflection in the mass consciousness, taking into account a pluralism of opinions, and the elaboration of scientifically-grounded prospects. The party sees its task as further stimulating a creative search in social sciences and encouraging growth in the theoretical arsenal of restructuring.

However, radical changes in the attitude to science are necessary. Science which "finds no appreciation" sooner or later dies; and practice, with such an attitude to scientific knowledge, grows blind and enfeebled. All this is unacceptable to us. So, when we make requests of scientists, we must show greater trust and create all the necessary conditions for creativity and the search for new things. The tasks of accelerating of scientific and technical progress must be viewed in the general context of social development. The main attention, scientists believe, should be paid to an analysis of problems at the "interface" of various sciences—natural, technical, and social. Close coordination among them is today ensuring revolutionary breakthroughs in all areas of the development of science and technology. Accordingly, there is a need for greater influence by social research throughout the whole range of scientific and technical progress and its human dimension.

In drawing lessons from the past, we need to get social examination of scientific technical and engineering projects going in a real way and on a large scale, with the participation of broad circles among the public, in order to minimize or, better still, exclude entirely the ecological and other costs, which are possible if these projects are designed and implemented without control.

In the last 3 years the process of growing awareness of the huge role of education as one of the basic factors in economic and social progress and spiritual renewal has been taking place actively in the party and in society. We have critically evaluated the situation in this field too and worked out a program for changes in the process of training and education. A great deal of extra money is being directed here, and the computerization of the learning process is being developed significantly. The salary of teachers has been raised. Of course, expenditure on education and science is great, but the price for lagging behind would be incomparably greater. Without high quality education, scientific research, and general professional standards, without all this we cannot achieve the aims of restructuring.

We need to create all the conditions for the new generation of Soviet people to have, as they enter conscious labor and political life, a high degree of ideology and morality, a good knowledge of their profession and a wide cultural horizon, and to be ready to take on themselves responsibility for the country's fate.

Soviet cultural figures are called on to play a great role in the socialist renewal of our society. Consolidating creative forces on the platform of restructuring has been the party's practical task in the post-April period. We can state today that overadministration in the leadership of culture and exhortation and lecturing addressed to artists are things of the past. In the spiritual sphere, an atmosphere of competitiveness and of free creative search is gradually being built up, based on the civil responsibility of artists to their socialist society.

Artistic culture is a living link to the succession of the generations, it helps a person to feel at one with his people, its history, and its hopes for the future, and lays the groundwork for any practical activity and for lofty moral ideals. Our journalistic, artistic, and scientific publications are conducting a discussion—unprecedented in scale, frankness, and intellectual meatiness—on the ways to renew socialism and on history and the present day. This is remarkable.

The party highly values the growing contribution of the intelligentsia to the implementation of restructuring. We welcome the stepping up of public and political activity by representatives of science, education, and culture. We await new creative discoveries and a large breakthrough in all spheres of thought and spirit from them. As a whole, cultural processes are developing on a healthy foundation.

However, we would be guilty of lacking objectivity and sinning against the truth if we said that they are proceeding without contradictions and without excesses which sometimes go beyond the limits of socialist values. Both in society as a whole and among the intelligentsia, conservatism and nonacceptance of innovations are manifested. There is also superficiality in assessing the events that are occurring and even irresponsibility in the approach to the complex problems of our development. Unfortunately, one sometimes has to observe that some comrades, even at this fateful time for the country, are somehow incapable of giving up infighting, group passions, and personal ambitions. There are also quite a few of those who view the creative search with irritation and regard the growing diversity as a deviation from the principles of socialist art. This is understandable: For too long uniformity, monotonous sameness, and mediocrity were presented as the yardstick of progress.

We still do not have the habit of discussion, dissidence, and free contention. I would not like to dramatize the situation, and there are no particular grounds to do so. But it would not be reasonable to fail to note such phenomena and to pass over them in silence.

If we speak of the main trends of policy in the sphere of science, education, and culture in the period of restructuring, they are seen as a return to Leninist principles, a turning toward man, toward the spiritual enrichment of the people. The party sees its task in stepping up efforts for the sake of this humane goal.

4. Democratization of International Relations [subhead]

Comrades, restructuring in the USSR has become a factor of world significance. The cardinal changes in our own house have also required new approaches to international affairs. In assessing Soviet foreign policy in the postwar period we do not forget that imperialism created around us and our allies an actual emergency situation. The Western military bloc led by the United States behaved with open aggression toward socialism. The military threat to us was constant. It has not been removed to this day. The Soviet Union, however, together with its allies, simply could not but react to this, as well as to the single-minded psychological war against socialist countries. Nonetheless in learning lessons from the past it is impossible not to admit that the command-administrative methods did not bypass the foreign policy sphere either.

It even happened that decisions of major importance were made by a narrow circle of persons, without a collective, all-round examination and analysis, and sometimes without due consultation with our friends. This led to an inadequate reaction to international events and to the policies of other states, and even to erroneous decisions. Unfortunately, it was not always weighed up what one or another option for action would cost the people or what it could result in. In response to the nuclear challenge thrown down to us and to the whole socialist world, it was essential to achieve strategic parity with the United States. That was done. However, having concentrated vast resources and attention on the military aspect of opposition to imperialism, we did not always use the political opportunities offered by fundamental changes in the world to ensure the state's security and to reduce tension and achieve mutual understanding among the peoples. As a result, we allowed ourselves to be drawn into the arms race, which could not fail to have an effect on the country's socioeconomic development and on its international position. The arms race, moreover, was coming close to the critical point.

Against that background our traditional political and social activity in favor of peace and disarmament began to become less convincing. To put it more pointedly, if this development had not been restrained by logic, we could indeed have found ourselves on the brink of a military confrontation. This is why not simply an improvement in foreign policy was needed, but a decisive renewal of it.

For that a new type of political thinking was required. The foundation for this was laid at the Central Committee April Plenum and the 27th party congress. It provided our international activity, in the conditions of restructuring, with a philosophical basis. The new thinking is not a closed and completed doctrine. It is dialectical. It allows policies to be constantly improved and developed in keeping with the course of real life. And this, of course, is in keeping with our socialist choice, with Leninist principles. In the same way, in internal affairs the Soviet leadership turned to Lenin, to his experience: everywhere, in any situation to act from a position of realism.

Only a foreign policy like that can effectively serve restructuring. Only in that case can it count on a realistic attitude on the part of those to whom it is addressed. Only in this capacity does it acquire the ability to assist in saving the world from impending thrusts. In analyzing the world today we have formed a clearer idea that international relations, without losing their class nature, are being increasingly realized as relations among people. We have taken into account the greater role in world affairs of peoples, nations, and the new national formations that are emerging. Given that situation in international affairs, one cannot fail to take into account the variety of interests. Taking them into account is an important element in new political thinking.

We have tried to interpret in greater depth the idea, first embodied in Marxism, of the interconnection between proletarian-class and general human interests from the standpoint of the present day, which is characterized by an increase in the nuclear threat, the aggravation of other global problems and the intensification of the internationalization of all the processes in the world—which is increasingly integral and interconnected despite its contradictoriness.

This has led us to a conclusion on the priority of values common to all mankind in our age. This is where the core of the new political thinking lies. It has allowed us to evaluate on a larger scale the vital significance, for contemporary international relations, of moral values, which have over the course of centuries been worked out by peoples and pooled and elaborated by the great minds of mankind.

In analyzing the fundamental changes in the world, many stereotypes that have fettered our potential and have to a certain extent provided opportunities to those who were engaged in distorting our real intentions are being overcome. A major role was played by our moving out to broad contacts with representatives of other countries, from heads of state and government to ordinary citizens, with generally acknowledged authorities in

science and culture, with outstanding writers, with leaders and delegations of political parties, social organizations and movements, with trade union and social democratic leaders, and with religious figures and parliamentarians.

Such a richness of direct communication, as it were, opens the Soviet Union anew to the outside world. And we, for our part have received the possibility of better seeing and understanding the surrounding world, taking part in discussion of its problems and in the search for an approach to resolving them, deriving what is useful from ideas stemming from other cultures and spiritual traditions, which found expression, for example, in the Delhi Declaration of 1986. With the aid of this "feedback," it has become easier to find mutual understanding on the significance of such values as freedom and democracy. All this has provided Soviet foreign policy with dynamism and has made it possible to advance a whole number of major initiatives.

These include the program for the phased elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000, the system for all-embracing security, freedom of choice, balance of interests, the "common European home," restructuring of relations in the Asia-Pacific region, defense sufficiency and the nonoffensive doctrine, the reduction of the level of armaments as a path to the strengthening of national and regional security, the recall of troops and bases from other people's territories, confidence-building measures, international economic security, and the idea of directly involving the authority of science in world politics. Dialogue, and—in the sphere of disarmament—a readiness for deep mutual control are at the heart of our contacts through interstate channels.

This has made it possible to extend the range of trust far beyond the boundaries of the normal world outlook. We have discovered considerable potential for mutual understanding and a readiness for coexistence and cooperation, even in influential circles that are very far from us ideologically. Our sincere open invitations to engage in joint thinking and quests have received a great response throughout the world.

Glasnost and restructuring are imparting "material" persuasiveness to our foreign policy ideas and initiatives. This approach has made possible major breakthroughs in world politics, above all in disarmament, such as at Geneva and Reykjavik, which provided real movement to the negotiating process and predetermined the success of the summits in Washington and Moscow. As a result, the entire international situation is changing.

In the context of the new thinking there has been an examination of socialism's position in the world. Together with our friends, we have tried in a comradely way to free the internationalist essence of our relations from the accretions of the past. Personal contacts between leaders of parties and states have been revitalized and have become businesslike and frequent. Coordination of the socialist community's foreign policy is being perfected. World socialism is living through a difficult and crucial period. The attainment of new frontiers by the socialist countries and the revealing of their potential in national and international frameworks are raising the prestige and the role of socialism in world development.

A key place in the new thinking is occupied by the concept of free choice. We are convinced of the universality of this principle for international relations, when the very survival of civilization has become the main worldwide problem common to all [obobshchayushchaya]. This concept has been brought about by the unprecedented and growing diversity in the world. We are witnessing a phenomenon such as the active inclusion in world history of billions of people who for centuries remained outside its bounds. These billions of people are emerging on the stage of independent historical creativity in totally new conditions. In a setting of mounting national self-awareness everywhere, they will still have their say in seeking their own choice of path.

In this situation, the imposition from outside by any means—not to mention military means—of a social system, way of life, or policy constitutes the dangerous armor of past years. Sovereignty, independence, equal rights, and noninterference are becoming the generally acknowledged norms of international relations, which is in itself a major gain for the 20th century. Resisting freedom of choice means placing yourself in opposition to the objective course of history itself. This is why the policy of force in all its forms and manifestations has historically outlived itself.

In a word, we are profoundly convinced that the new thinking and the policy based on it correctly reflect the pressing requirements and imperatives of the world today. They have revived hope and opened the way to qualitative changes in mankind's awareness. We can give an unconditional yes in answer to the question that worries Soviet people most of all and on which they wish to hear an appraisal of the result of work over the 3 years: Has it been possible to remove the threat of war?

How is this expressed? It is expressed above all in the fact that the axis of international life is moving from confrontation to cooperation, mutual understanding, and talks with the prospects of reaching specific results, primarily regarding weapons of mass destruction.

Soviet-U.S. relations have improved. A treaty has been concluded to eliminate some nuclear arms. The all-European process has been revitalized at the interstate level, and particularly at that of the public. The Geneva accords and the withdrawal of our troop contingent from Afghanistan, which has begun already, are important

international landmarks in the matter of political settlements to regional conflicts, which are fraught with danger for the world as a whole and hold up the peoples' progress.

From the rostrum of our party conference, on behalf of the party and the people, may I once again express profound gratitude to the soldiers, officers, and civilian specialists and all those whose fate has been touched and who have been hurt by this war. Our troops are leaving Afghanistan at the behest of the motherland which has shown wisdom, having over those years acquired new political and moral experience, a more profound understanding of the modern world, its contradictions and difficulties, on the way to the future.

All in all, comrades, an analysis of existing realities enables us to suppose that if it is possible to strengthen and develop these realities, the world at the turn of the century will be determined by the following trends: gradual demilitarization and humanization of international relations, when reason, knowledge, and moral standards rather than egotistical striving and prejudices finally move states to resolve the many contradictions in the world and achieve a balance of interests, and when the right of everyone to freedom of choice is recognized. Guaranteeing the security of states will move more and more out of the sphere of the correlation of military potentials to that of political interaction and strict compliance with international obligations.

A comprehensive system of international security will be formed, chiefly by increasing the role and efficiency of the United Nations Organization. The colossal growth of scientific and technical potential will be exploited in a more civilized way in order to solve jointly, for the good of all mankind, global economic, ecological, power, food, medical, and other problems. Varied and voluntary association between independent states and peoples will mutually enrich them reliably, materially, and spiritually, and will strengthen the structure of universal peace.

Are there no illusions here? Have imperialist sources of aggression and wars really vanished? No. We are not forgetting the threat to peace from imperialist militarism and we believe that for the moment no guarantees have been provided for the irreversibility of the positive processes begun. The new political thinking allows precisely for the spotting and discovery of new opportunities for opposing the politics of force on a political basis that is wider than before. These opportunities are strengthened by new objective factors that have emerged in the second half of this century. It is this that determines our defense development, the efficiency of which must from now on be determined predominantly by qualitative parameters regarding both technology and military science and the makeup of the armed forces. It should ensure reliable security for the Soviet state and its allies and be implemented in strict accordance with our defense doctrine.

We will continue to look for ways to secure peace and international cooperation through our international political activity. Relations with the socialist countries will continue to be at the forefront in the future. We will consistently follow a policy of strengthening our relations with the developing countries and the Nonaligned Movement and have active dialogue and talks with state figures authorized by their countries, above all on the focus of world politics: disarmament.

During the years of restructuring, we have improved or set up relations for the first time with a large number of states, both neighboring and very distant, and with no one have we spoiled relations. We will try to act this way in the future as well. The CPSU regards itself as an inseparable part of the world communist movement, which is now conducting a difficult search for a way out onto a new stage in its historical development. Based on the foundations of full equality and respect, we will actively participate in this search. There is increasing international potential in our new relations with numerous public forces, representing world science and culture, with political parties of different ideological tendencies, above all with Socialists, Social Democrats, members of labor parties, and other so-called left-wing circles and movements. Our solidarity with the workers of the whole world, with those struggling against colonialism, racism, and reaction remains immutable. Comrades, notwithstanding certain mistakes and errors in the past, Soviet foreign policy as a whole has rendered great services to the country, to socialism, and to the whole of humanity.

Restructuring has demanded new qualities of it, both in essence and in form. Just as in domestic policy, it must in practice absorb the collective thought of the party and the people and directly take into consideration not only the changes under way, but also foreseeable ones. The objective processes in the world and our potential should become the subject of constant scientific and public discussion with the participation of the public and its organizations. The quality of information on international issues must be raised by an order of magnitude.

Within the framework of reforming the political system, an effective mechanism with full constitutional powers for the businesslike and qualified discussion of international political issues must be created.

II. Reform of the Political System—The Most Important Guarantee of the Irreversibility of Restructuring [section subhead]

Comrades, by presenting the program for radical democratization of public and political life and reform of the political system for discussion by the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference, the CPSU Central Committee believes that this will make it possible to radically raise the effectiveness of our political institutions and reveal the potential of socialist sovereignty of the people.

1. Why a Reform of the Political System Is Needed [subhead]

We are beginning this work not from scratch, not out of nothing. Behind us we have the unique experience of the first socialist democracy in the world. The forms and methods of sovereignty of the people, engendered by socialism, have had an immense influence on the social progress of humanity and have become a part of contemporary political culture. It was in our country that the power of the workers—embodied in the republic of soviets—as well as workers control, the right to work, and other most important social rights of the individual, and the equality of women and men, and of nations and nationalities were born. In other words, we were the first in many democratic undertakings of the 20th century.

So why is the task of radically reforming the political system being advanced today? Comrades, above all, the fact of the matter is—and we must admit this today—that at a certain stage the political system, created as a result of the victory of the October Revolution, was seriously deformed.

As a result, the absolute power of Stalin and his entourage and the wave of repressions and illegality became possible. The administrative command methods of management which developed in those years had a pernicious effect on various aspects of our society's development. Many of the difficulties we are experiencing now have their roots in that system. The decisions of the 20th party congress raised possibilities for overcoming the violation of Leninist principles of party and state life.

Those possibilities, however, were not utilized, mainly because the significance of socialist democracy was underestimated and disparaged. This once again led to a recurrence of cult phenomena. The existing political system proved incapable of preserving us from the buildup of the manifestations of stagnation in the economic and social life of recent decades, and doomed to failure the reforms that were undertaken at that time. The ever greater concentration of economic management functions in the hands of the party political leadership became characteristic, while at the same time the role of the executive apparatus was hypertrophied. The number of persons elected to the various state and public bodies increased until it comprised a third of the adult population of the country; yet at the same time the great mass of the population was removed from real participation in deciding the affairs of state and society.

In the period of stagnation, the administrating apparatus proliferated to almost 100 union ministries and departments and 800 republican ones, and in effect began dictating its will with regard to both the economy and to policy. It was the departments and other administrative structures that had the responsibility of executing the decisions that had been made. It was their action or inaction that determined what should happen or not happen. The soviets, and in many respects the party bodies, found themselves unable to control the pressure of departmental interests. It became a universal rule that the body that made a decision bore no economic responsibility for the consequences of its actions.

A further serious shortcoming of the established political system was that public life was excessively dominated by the state. Of course, the tasks and functions of the state under socialism are considerably wider than in the conditions that exist under capitalism. However, according to the thought of the founders of Marxism-Leninism, that expansion of administrative functions must be achieved not by strengthening the power that rests on orders, on decrees, and on coercion, but above all by activating the democratic factor and involving the broad masses of the people in governing.

Let us recall Lenin's well-known definition of the socialist state as being no longer a state in the proper sense of the word, or even as a half-state which is gradually developing into public self-government. Unfortunately, after Lenin's death, what prevailed—in theory, and indeed in practice also—was the approach to the state in the full, that is to say, the old sense of that concept. Regulation by the state was extended to an inordinately wide sphere of public activity. The striving to take detailed centralized planning and control into every nook and cranny of life literally swaddled society and became a serious inhibition to people's initiative and that of public organizations and collectives.

Among other things, this has given rise to a shadow economy and culture, taking advantage of the inability of state bodies to satisfy the public's material and spiritual requirements promptly and completely. The bureaucratization of state structures and the weakening of the masses' social creativity have accustomed society to thinking in terms of a single option and static thinking. An oversimplified, curtailed image of socialist people's power, whereby actual wielding of power is identified not with active political activity by the workers but first and foremost with executive bodies, has formed and so far continues to influence people's awareness.

Finally, the existing political system has for decades been adapting itself not to the organization of public life within the framework of the laws, but chiefly to fulfilling self-willed directions and instructions. The proclamation in words of democratic principles alongside authoritarianism in fact, incantations about people's power from the rostrum alongside voluntarism and subjectivism in practice, endless talk about democratic institutions alongside trampling of the norms of the socialist way of life in reality, and a lack of criticism and glasnost—all this became quite widespread and took root in society. The price paid for such methods proved to be harsh: indifference, weakening of the masses' social activeness, and alienation of the worker from social property and government. It is indeed in the ossified system of power, its command-pressure structure, that the fundamental

problems of restructuring, economic reform, and development of the social-cultural sphere, of educating people in an attitude of an owner's commitment toward everything happening in the country, are today rooted.

In the spring of 1985 the party began a resolute struggle for renewing socio-political structures. The step-by-step development of the new economic mechanism is in progress. The character of social relations is changing. The legal foundations of restructuring are being strengthened. We are learning democracy and glasnost; we are learning to debate and hold discussions, to tell each other the truth. This, of course, is no small thing. But the processes of democratization, both at the enter and locally, are developing slowly. Today we must have the courage to admit: If the political system remains immobile, without change, then we will not cope with the tasks of restructuring. When posing the issue of a cardinal reform of the political system, we must proceed first and foremost from a clear idea of which qualities have withstood the test of time and are necessary for us today, and which, on the contrary, must be reduced to the minimum or totally overcome.

It seems to us that we should be talking about accomplishing the following basic tasks: first, to do all we can in order for millions and millions of workers to be involved in the government of the country—not just in words, but in actions;

Second, to open up the maximum scope for the processes of self-regulation and self-government of society, and create the conditions for the full development of the initiative of citizens, of representative organs of power, and of party and public organizations of labor collectives;

Third, to perfect a system for the free formation and expression of the interests and will of all classes and social groups, and the harmonization and implementation of them in the domestic and foreign policy of the Soviet state;

Fourth, to guarantee conditions for the free development of every nation and ethnic group, and to strengthen their friendship and equal cooperation on the principles of internationalism;

Fifth, to radically reinforce socialist legality and law and order, in order to exclude the possibility of the usurpation of power or abuses, to counter bureaucratism and formalism effectively, to provide reliable guarantees for the protection of citizens' constitutional rights and freedoms, and also for the fulfillment of their obligations to society and state;

Sixth, to clearly delineate the functions of party and state bodies in accordance with Lenin's concept of the Communist Party's role as the political vanguard of society and the Soviet state's role as the instrument of people's power;

Seventh and finally, to create an effective mechanism to ensure the timely self-renewal of the political system, taking into account changing domestic and international conditions, a mechanism which is capable of constantly and actively developing and implementing the principles of socialist democracy and self-government in all spheres of life.

2. Restructuring and Human Rights [subhead]

The ultimate aim of the political system's reform, and the chief criterion for how far we manage to implement it, is the comprehensive enrichment of human rights and the enhancement of the Soviet people's social activeness. This issue occupies a central place in the theory and practice of socialism. An impressive edifice of a citizen's guaranteed rights in many spheres has been built on the foundation created in our country by the October Revolution. We enjoy them, and—why hide it—we rarely give a thought to the fact that all these rights that we are so accustomed to still remain only a hope for working people in many parts of the world, targets in their struggle.

Human rights in our society are not a gift from the state, nor are they a favor from someone. They are an inalienable characteristic of socialism; they are a gain of socialism. The individual and society, the citizen and the state, the person and the collective—all these are different planes of one and the same problem. The way in which it is tackled reflects the nature of a political system and to a large extent determines the results of people's activity and the whole tenor of public life.

The socialist solution to this problem consists of an organic combination of the collective and individual principles. In this key question of the structuring of society, our philosophy originates from the famous formula in the Communist Party manifesto—the free development of each person is a condition for the free development of everyone.

Comrades, it is important for us to understand that it is a person's position in society, the rights granted to him, and the obligations placed upon him, which in the final analysis, determine his social, labor, and political activity. Moreover, we not only have to understand that but to act in that direction when implementing economic reform and the reform of the political system.

What are the specific tasks to be tackled here? First and foremost, the social rights of the individual. In our country a ramified system of the concern of society for people has taken shape, but at the present stage in its development we see its weaknesses and deficiencies. We are striving to do all we can to improve working conditions, raise the quality of public education and the health service, and provide a better level of social security for the working people. All that is an expression of the firm aim of the party to provide Soviet people with equality and protection in society.

This is what has to be said in this connection. We want to strengthen the guarantees of the social and economic rights of the individual. To do this, the relevant changes have to be wrought both in economic and political conditions. But both the nature of these changes and the time needed to bring them about are closely tied up with the labor activity of all members of Soviet society. The social blessings we get from society and our attitude to labor are inextricably linked. It is important that every person understands the need for a demanding attitude toward himself. Here yet again one comes across the importance of principles of financial autonomy in economic management.

These allow not only earnings to be coordinated with the labor contribution of each person and every collective, but the satisfaction of social needs as well. Boons and blessings do not appear of their own accord. It is only labor that creates them. An unconscientious attitude to what one is doing, poor labor discipline, inertia, and living at others' social expense are unacceptable to us.

Yes, we know that during the years of stagnation quite a few difficult problems in the sphere of labor activity accumulated. Now we have to correct matters and make up for what was left undone, and that is not so simple since it concerns the whole of society.

Restructuring has posed the question of a person's political rights. Management methods of administration by injunction and the restrictions on democracy thereby involved had a particularly detrimental effect on the implementation of political rights. All this acted as a brake on and complicated the process of overcoming the alienation of a person from power, from politics, from the process started by the October Revolution. The draft political reform which is being submitted to our conference for discussion is precisely calculated to speed up the process of achieving the broad involvement of the working people in managing the country's affairs. To do this actual conditions must naturally be created. The electoral system must be changed, the structure of organs of power and administration must be reorganized, and legislation must be updated. This does, of course, presuppose the relevant changes in the social awareness of millions upon millions of people.

Right now people at the local level are often saying and writing that restructuring has not reached them. They ask when this will happen. But restructuring is not manna from heaven and you must not wait until it is delivered from somewhere. You must create it in your own town or village, through your own work in your labor collective. Today as never before actions are needed, not talk about restructuring. A great deal here will depend on our cadres and leaders at rayon, town, oblast, republic, and union level. By no means are only the leaders to blame for the fact that we still have quite a few places where restructuring is marking time. As is well known, blaming those in charge is very easy indeed and, incidentally, it is something that is very widespread in our country. We can understand this habit developing when the social atmosphere in the country, the activity of party and state organs, did not create the necessary prerequisites for manifesting an active civic position. But now, comrades, everything is radically changing and many have become actively engaged in all the processes of restructuring. Therefore, we must ask a straight question of those who still complain and blame those in charge, the bosses: What have you done for restructuring then? (prolonged applause)

I want to especially dwell on the political freedoms that give a person the opportunity to express his opinion on any issue. The implementation of these freedoms is a real guarantee that any problem that is of public interest is comprehensively discussed and that all the pros and cons are weighed. This helps to find the most correct decisions, taking into consideration all the diverse opinions and the actual possibilities.

In a word, comrades, what we are talking about is a new role for public opinion in the country. There is no need to be afraid of newness or the unfamiliar nature of the opinion. There is no need to shy away and go to extremes at each turn the discussion takes.

I also want to touch on such a fundamental issue as the freedom of conscience. Enhanced attention is now being paid to it in connection with the millennium of the introduction of Christianity in Russia. We do not conceal our attitude to the religious world outlook as an unmaterialistic and unscientific one, but this is no reason for a disrespectful attitude to the spiritual world of people who believe, and even less for the use of any manner of administrative methods to assert materialistic views. The Leninist decree on the separation of church and state and of school and church adopted 70 years ago created new foundations for relations between them. It is well known that these relations have not always developed normally, but life itself and history have united believers and nonbelievers as citizens of the Soviet country and patriots, both in the years of the trials of the Great Patriotic War and in the creation of our socialist society and the struggle for peace.

All believers, regardless of their religion, are citizens of the USSR with full rights; the overwhelming majority of them participate actively in our economic and public life and in the accomplishment of restructuring tasks. The draft law on freedom of conscience which is now being prepared is based on Leninist principles and takes into account all contemporary realities.

Now for the individual rights of citizens: Here too a more precise legislative regulation is required. Some things have already been done. People have greeted with great satisfaction the decision not to give consideration to anonymous letters, the establishment of criminal accountability for persecution for criticism, the procedure for lodging a complaint with the courts regarding

unlawful actions by officials, the payment of compensation for damage caused by such actions, and a strengthening of the protection and rights of the mentally ill. Law and order is meant to guarantee a strict observance of the rights of citizens to the inviolability of their personal lives, dwellings, telephone conversations, correspondence, and the things they send by mail and telegraph. The law must reliably protect the personal dignity of the individual.

In fully protecting and guaranteeing the rights and freedoms of Soviet people, we cannot examine them in isolation from citizens' obligations. Democracy presupposes reasonable social order, without which there cannot in fact be any personal freedom. Our legislation has as its aim to resolutely defend society from all sorts of self-seekers, scroungers, pilferers, hooligans, slanderers, and louts. Society must have at its disposal effective means to act against antisocial elements, reeducating them and involving them in a normal working life. And another problem: the assertion of personal rights and freedoms and the overall expansion of democracy and glasnost must go hand in hand with the strengthening of legality, with the instilling of unfailing respect for the law. Democracy is not compatible with willfulness, irresponsibility, or with lack of discipline.

As you know, we have on several occasions recently run up against attempts to use democratic rights for antidemocratic ends. Some people think it is possible to resolve any question by this means, from the redrawing of borders to the creation of opposition parties. The CPSU believes that such abuses of democratization run fundamentally counter to the tasks of restructuring and are contrary to the people's interests. (prolonged applause)

The human rights problem also has an important international aspect. We are deeply convinced of the correctness of our socialist choice and firmly intend, removing all distortions and deformations, to enrich the rights of the individual precisely on a socialist basis, acting within the framework and by those methods that accord with our system's nature.

However, in contemporary conditions human rights and above all the right to life are becoming an object of concern for the whole world and are becoming internationalized like many other aspects of social life.

We are ready to actively cooperate with all other countries, to exchange experience, and to scrupulously fulfill the obligations we have undertaken. We are convinced that restructuring will make it possible to show the indisputable superiority of socialism in guaranteeing all human rights—social, political, and individual. (applause)

3. Improving the Organization of Authority [subhead]

Comrades, it is well known that our state was born as a tool of the working class dictatorship. On the threshold of the sixties the conclusion was drawn that it would gradually grow into one belonging to the whole people. But the deeper we grasp the content of the political process, the more obvious it becomes that we must raise our statehood to one belonging to the whole people in the full meaning of that concept. For this we need an organization of authority and management where the final decision will always belong to the people, when the process of self-regulation and self-management of society has reached its maximum extent. A correct distribution of authoritiative power between the main links of the political system, first and foremost between the party and state, is of principle importance. Life is setting before us in all its urgency the task of resurrecting the plenipotentiary authority of the soviets of people's deputies, and we cannot get away with half measures here. We must have a comprehensive approach to the problem and find a radical solution to it.

The discussion before the conference showed that the measures proposed by the Central Committee for restructuring the soviets are meeting with support and approval. The basic principle can be put like this: Not a single state, economic, or social question can be solved bypassing the soviets. The party's policy—economic, social, national—must be conducted first and foremost via the soviets of people's deputies as the organs of people's power.

The need to reorganize the management of local affairs on the principles of self-management, self-financing, and self-sufficiency cannot be postponed. It must become the organic continuation of economic reform, linking together the interests of society as a whole and the demands of each of its territorial cells and labor collectives, putting an end to poor interdepartmental liaison and the fragmentation of the local economy. It is necessary to establish total responsibility and independence of the soviet in solving the problems of developing the territories under their jurisdiction, to increase the allocation to their budgets a part of the profit of enterprises, regardless of their subordination. The soviets must have solid sources for their incomes, based on long-term norms, including income from all enterprises located in their territory, and they must accumulate the means to implement large-scale tasks.

They must also have the capability they need to take in money from the people with the aim of solving questions of social, cultural, and consumer development which are general for the inhabitants of this or that town, rayon, or settlement. The handover to the jurisdiction of local soviets of enterprises whose output is connected with satisfying the people's demands must be intensified, as must giving them the possibility of placing orders with enterprises subordinated to higher organizations.

It is necessary to precisely and clearly define the legal relations between the soviets, enterprises, kolkhozes, and their labor collectives. One ought to decisively renew the

very organization of representative bodies' work, expand the range of issues that are decided exclusively at their sessions, make provisions for some of the delegates to be released from time to time from their official and production duties to work in the soviets in constituencies, and make the specific control functions of the soviets and their standing commissions more effective.

At sessions during the election of executive committees and approval of the heads of departments and directorates, the nomination of alternative candidacies, secret ballots, competition, and other democratic forms should become the rule. We have to guarantee that the work of soviets of all sections is conducted in public, and constantly in the electorate's view. The soviets, according to the Leninist plan, combine legislative, managing, and control functions. However, this does not negate the rational division of labor between state bodies, which is particularly important for interrelations between the soviets and their executive committees. In the interests of the correct demarcation of functions and the reinforcement of the control of representative bodies over the activities of executive committees, many of those taking part in the discussion have voiced the proposal that local bodies of authority should have soviet chairmen and soviet presidia working full time. They would make preparations for sessions, and coordinate the work of standing commissions and deputies' groups; in a word all that is connected with organizing the intensive work of a representative body of authority.

Since, in present-day conditions, the task is being set of enhancing the role of elected bodies and deputies, the view of those comrades who believe that in view of the new tasks it is very important to buttress the role of the soviets as the people's representative bodies with the party's authority seems well founded. But this has to be done on a strictly legal basis. The most realistic path here as a rule is to recommend the first secretaries of the relevant party committees to the posts of soviet chairmen. In heading the soviets and their presidia they will in the most active way possible assist in improving all aspects of the activity of bodies representing the people. This is a matter of great importance. It ought to be examined in more detail.

Now, first secretaries are usually ispolkom members. Many years of experience leads, whether intentionally or not, to a strengthening of the prerogatives of the ispolkoms and their apparatus, to the detriment of the authority of the soviets as representative bodies. If the first secretary of the party committee is elected chairman of the soviet, this will enhance the authority of the soviet and increase control over the activity of the ispolkom and its chairman and make it possible to delimit more precisely the functions of party and local soviets, in conditions where the center of gravity of administrative activity moves to the soviets.

On the other hand, comrades, the recommendations of party leaders for the posts of chairmen of soviets will place them under more effective control by the workers, since the election will take place at sessions by secret ballot. This means that a party leader's mandate which the Communists entrust to him will each time be checked and confirmed by the representatives of the people at all levels of soviets.

Of course, it is possible the recommended candidate for party secretary will not be supported by the deputies. Then it is clear that the party committee and the Communists will have to draw the appropriate conclusions from that. The establishment of a rule, according to which members of an ispolkom and the leaders of its departments and directorates cannot be members of the relevant soviet, must serve as the best delimitation of powers between representative and executive bodies. As deputies to the soviet, they now take part in sessions and give instructions to themselves. It is clear that they have an interest in those instructions being as small and as weak as possible. It is expedient to extend this principle to judges, prosecutors, arbitrators and—in the USSR and union and autonomous republics—to members of government and leaders of departments as well.

The need to introduce a number of democratic restrictions on holding elected positions has also fallen due. Past experience shows that the absence of these restrictions has been one of the chief causes of abuse of power, both at the center and in the regions. We know of many examples where perfectly worthy and capable leaders, having spent decades in their posts, have outlived their usefulness and, continuing to occupy the leader's chair, have turned into a brake and a burden on the cause. The material from the discussion held before the conference shows that a change in such a situation has, essentially, become a demand of the party and the people as a whole. To be sure, different points of view were expressed here. Some doubted whether a reservation was necessary regarding the possibility of election for a third term in a row, even if only in exceptional cases. In the opinion of others, the extension of powers for a third term must be permitted only for the highest tier of authority. Let us discuss these proposals.

There is one more thing: If in the Theses the restriction on terms is made to apply only to elective offices, many participants in the discussion proposed that it be extended to officials appointed and confirmed by the soviet. In our opinion, that is a correct observation and it should be supported.

There was also discussion of a proposal restricting the tenure of elected offices after reaching a certain age. There were also votes against, which held that this would mean restricting the sovereign rights of the electorate. I think that, with due account for the broad democratization of the whole process of forming the organs of power and management, this problem will lose its acuteness and will be addressed by the voters and deputies themselves with the aid of democratic procedures. A necessary condition for raising the activity of the soviets is the

real political weight of the people's deputy; this is directly connected with the whole process of forming representative organs of power.

Hence the need for a resolute renewal of our electoral system. We have already embarked on fulfilling the decisions of the 27th party congress. During the last electoral campaign, elections were conducted in some of the constituencies according to the multi-candidacy scheme, and in many constituencies two or more candidates were proposed. The overall number of candidacies discussed in the country as a whole was twice the number of seats. Competitiveness breathed life into the elections, intensified the voters' interest in them, and raised the deputies' sense of responsibility.

Now we have to go further, mastering and consolidating new approaches to the electoral system. In forming the soviets it is necessary to guarantee the right of an unrestricted nomination of candidacies, broad and free discussion of them, rigorous compliance with the democratic procedure of election, regular reporting back by the deputies, and the possibility of their recall. More wide-ranging powers have to be granted to constituency pre-election meetings, which should become democratic forums for the competitive selection of candidates.

In general, comrades, our corps of deputies should henceforth be formed not by quota but primarily on the basis of the vibrant and free will of the electorate. The first condition for the effective work of the soviets is the election of people who are principled, vigorous, and experienced, with a mind for state affairs, capable of worthily representing their electorate, and vigorously acting in the organs of power. And one should not be apprehensive of the disporportionate representation of various strata of the population. We have militant, politically literate, vigorous people in the working class, among the peasantry, and the intelligentsia. It is only necessary to create a well adjusted competitive mechanism which will guarantee their optimum selection by the electorate. And then all of the main groups of the population and their interests will be reflected in the composition of the soviets.

As we understand it, there is agreement in society on the question of reducing the numerical composition of local soviets. When the Central Committee Theses for the conference were being discussed, there was wide support for the proposal that a single 5-year term of office should be set for all the soviets. Under those conditions, the local soviet deputies will work with greater confidence. They will have enough time to realize their plans, but the voters will always retain the right either to recall a deputy who is remiss or has proved incompetent, or to enlarge the membership of the soviet, should the need arise.

Comrades, of decisive importance to the effective work of the soviets are the powers and their system of operation pertaining to the supreme organs of Soviet authority. As everyone can see, despite the fact that the deputies, Presidium and USSR Supreme Soviet commissions are carrying out useful work, the structure of our supreme organ of power and its working procedures need substantial changes.

In the discussion which has started on the Central Committee Theses, particular interest has been shown in this question. Numerous proposals have been forwarded suggesting that we turn to the experience of the first few post-October decades, when we had a system of soviet congresses in operation. These were broad and plenipotentiary people's gatherings, between which central executive committees were in operation. The massive scale of representation was combined with constant work on legislation, administration and control. Also expressed during the discussion was the idea of the need for direct representation in the country's supreme organ of power for our public organization. Generalizing these opinions, the CPSU Central Committee is putting the following proposals foward for examination by the conference:

1. To considerably extend workers' representation in the highest echelon of state power. For this, the territorial representation of the entire population in the Soviet of the Union and the representation of the nationalities and ethnic groups in the Soviet of Nationalities, currently in existence, will be supplemented by direct representation from public organizations included in our political system. In this way, 1,500 deputies would be elected, as now, from territorial and national okrugs, and approximately 750 more deputies would be elected at congresses or plenums of the central organs of party, trade union, cooperative, youth, women's, veteran, scientific and creative organizations, as well as others. A list of such organizations and the citeria for representation could be determined in the Constitution. All the deputies taken together, and elected for a period of 5 years, would constitute a new representative supreme organ of state power—the Congress of USSR People's Deputies.

It would assemble for its session once a year, deciding the most important constitutional, political and socio-economic questions in the country's life. For the purposes of discussing and resolving all issues of a legislative, administrative and monitoring nature, and for directing the work of accountable organs and lower-placed soviets, the Congress of People's Deputies would elect from its composition a relatively small—say some 400-450 persons—USSR Supreme Soviet, consisting of two chambers.

This would be the permanently functioning supreme body of authority accountable to the Congress of People's Deputies. In this way, all work on legislation and control would be concentrated directly in the Supreme Soviet and its commissions, which would be a new step on the way to democratizing the higher state structures. Periodic renewal of part of the composition of the USSR Supreme Soviet could also be contemplated.

2. It is necessary to step up the work of the USSR Supreme Soviet chambers, avoiding their present lack of functional distinctiveness. It stands to reason that draft laws and decisions on key issues of state life should, as before, be discussed and adopted by the members of both Supreme Soviet chambers. At the same time, the Soviet of Nationalities, representing all national-state and national-administrative formations of the country, could examine issues of economic and social development, interethnic relations, observance of legislation in this sphere, supervision of the activity of union ministries and departments affecting the interests of the republics, autonomous formations, etc.

In its turn, the Soviet of the Union, reflecting the interests of the people as a whole and the requirements of all classes and social groups, could concentrate on working out major social and economic programs and plans and work on policy issues in the spheres of price formation and taxes, labor relations, protection of citizens' rights, the strengthening of the country's defense capacity, ratification of international treaties and other matters. At our conference here we must agree on the delimitation of the chambers' functions on the level of principle and this should find concrete reflection in the USSR Constitution and in other legislative acts.

Discussion of the Theses has brought out one more topic that has been energetically debated: the correlation of higher party and state posts and their place in the structure of supreme power. In this connection, some believe it correct to return to the practice in existence under Lenin when the leader of the party was head of government at the same time. Others consider the combining of party and state posts to be undesirable in general. Still others favor instituting the office of president of the USSR, and then there are those who point to the incompatibility of the concept of a state accepting the rule of law and a situation in which the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee in effect fulfils the role of the country's supreme representative. Many other views are also being voiced. Comrades, this is a serious issue and one that we must discuss at our conference in detail and moreover, in such a manner that it meets with an optimum solution during the reform of the political system.

In the view of the CPSU Central Committee, increasing the role of the higher representative bodies and the entire system of soviets of people's deputies, strengthening the legal nature of power, and gaining a better representation of the Soviet Union in world affairs would be satisfied by instituting the office of chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet. It would have to be established that he is elected and recalled by means of a secret ballot of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies of which I was speaking, and he is completely responsible and accountable to it. In conditions of an overall increase in the role of the representative bodies, the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet should be endowed with sufficiently extensive state authority. He could, inter alia, provide overall leadership in drafting laws and the more important social and economic programs, decide key issues in the country's foreign policy, defense capacity and security, head the Defense Council, propose candidacies for chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, as well as carrying out a number of other obligations traditional for such an office of state. We are proposing that there should also be, within the structure of supreme power, a Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet that would work under the leadership of the chairman of the Supreme Soviet.

The makeup of the Presidium could include two first deputy chairmen, one of whom would be chairman of the USSR People's Control Committee; 15 deputies, one for each of the union republics; and representatives of the chambers, standing commissions and committees of the USSR Supreme Soviet. It would be the responsibility of the Presidium to convene sessions, coordinate the work of commissions of deputies of the Supreme Soviet, and it would also have certain representative and other powers.

It is expedient to strengthen the status of the standing commissions of the supreme organ of power which would be made up of members of the Supreme Soviet and deputies to the Congress of People's Deputies. They may be set up both separately for each chamber and jointly as joint committees. The powers of the commissions and committees should be substantially expanded in view of the new tasks, in particular to envisage that only after they have discussed the matter beforehand can decisions be made on major questions of domestic and foreign policy or appointments be made to the posts of heads of ministries and departments and of other officials. There should be greater recourse to open hearings in commissions and committees and to the establishment of special groups of deputies to study problems which cause acute public interest.

The question also arises of establishing within the structure of supreme power an organ such as a Committee for Constitutional Supervision elected by the Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR. It would monitor the conformity of our laws and other legal acts with the basic law of the country, and would be allotted sufficient powers for this purpose.

Incidentally, the existence of this committee would be an extra guarantee of democratic control over the activity of all officials, including those who occupy the highest posts.

3. The new forms of organizing the supreme power still do not in themselves guarantee its effectiveness. What is needed to achieve this is significant change in the very nature and operating style of the Supreme Soviet. The sessions must be relieved of long speeches and reports, overorganization, and formalism. They must become lively and demanding, and they must compare different versions of proposed decisions and discuss corrections,

addenda, and objections. It would be worth introducing days for the government to answer deputies' questions and expanding the practice of deputies' inquiries.

Of course, it could also happen that we do not have complete unanimity in adopting one decision or another. But this is a normal phenomenon in the democratic process. Anyway, long ago it was time for us to learn to listen carefully to the voice of our opponents, and not to regard them with deliberate prejudice. Socialist pluralism of opinion, arguments, discussion, comparison of views are the way to finding better, and the best, solutions.

In proposing these changes in the structure and organization of the work of the highest organ of power of the USSR, the CPSU Central Committee considers that many of them are acceptable for the supreme organs of power in the republics. These steps would help to raise their role and authority, and would mean as a whole a further extension of the rights of the union republics. Furthermore, unity in the structure and system of the democratic functioning of union and republic organs of power would ensure the efficiency and smoothness of the work of the whole system of soviets in its entirety.

Taking into account the intended changes, it is also essential to reconsider the questions of the formation, structure, and functions of the organs of power in the autonomous republics. If the delegates agree, all these proposals can be formulated in a special conference resolution. Restructuring of the soviets must not be delayed for long. In particular, as early as this autumn, it would be possible to discuss the relevant legislative acts in the USSR Supreme Soviet, and then, after the next elections, to carry out a reorganization of the all-union organs of state power next spring.

While strengthening the soviets as the foundation of representative democracy, it is essential to create conditions for the overall development of direct democracy: in production, in places of residence, at gatherings and rallies of citizens, in the process of discussion of the most important general state and local decisions.

The experience of the past few years has shown the effectiveness of nationwide discussion of drafts of major general state decisions: On state enterprises, the cooperative movement, school reform, the organization of health, and other things. We must make decisions much more frequently than we do now, with voting by citizens in villages, rayons, and towns, especially on questions which affect people vitally, and on which there is no unity of opinion. In such cases, let all problems be decided by the majority.

There are huge reserves contained in the development of all forms of the socialist self-management of the people. We already have a legal, a political, and to some extent a psychological basis to develop them widely, particularly in labor collectives.

Comprehensively evaluating our own experience and the experience of our friends in the socialist countries, we will have to contstantly think through the questions that arise here related to the expediency of the total or partial handing over of certain functions of state bodies to particular self-governing organizations. The main thing is that this should be done not formally, but in essence.

We are living witnesses of how the initiative of the working people is manifesting itself in the most diverse spheres under restructuring, and the development of democracy and glasnost. Although, to be frank, by no means everything here is straightforward, comrades. Take for example the labor collective, working under financial autonomy. It can function on the principle of self-financing only as a self-governing organism, and this means that new questions arise concerning the interaction between the general meeting and the council of the collective, between the party, trade union and Komsomol organizations and the administration, and relations between this whole complex and the soviets of people's deputies.

We may as yet have little experience, but every day it is becoming greater, and we must deal with it carefully in the interests of developing the self-governing process.

And lastly, about one other most important form of socialist sovereignty of the people, control. The idea of workers' control goes back to the October Revolution. As we know, it was thoroughly studied by Lenin in his last works. It was in control by the masses that he saw one of the decisive guarantees against arbitrariness, subjectivism and the abuse of power, a means for ensuring firm socialist discipline, be it labor, state, planning, economic or financial discipline. Control by the working people is a specific feature of the political system of socialism, organically inherent in our social system. And now, when we are unfolding the processes of democratization and self-governing, we must use this instrument of people's sovereignty to the full. As the Theses of the CPSU Central Committee state, it is necessary to create a single system of public and state control, subordinated to the elective bodies of power, and in order to impart the due weight to this system, the chairman of the Committee for People's Control could be, as has already been said, the first deputy of the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

This kind of control system, in which state and public principles are combined, and which is based on a broad network of people's controllers, working in labor collectives, will become a truly powerful force for cleansing society of negative phenomena, and be a mass school for self-governing.

In other words, on the one hand, we must restore the fine tradition of workers' and peasants' inspection of Lenin's time and, on the other, raise the entire work of control to the level of contemporary tasks.

4. The Democratization of State Management [subhead]

Comrades, now that the task of comprehensively expanding the participation of the working people in governing is being brought to the fore, we must comprehend how under specific conditions the principle of democratic centralism should be applied. Analysis of this question brings one to the conclusion that the main tendency which meets the demand for the development of society is decentralization, naturally carried out while preserving those functions of the center without which the realization of the advantages of socialism and the guaranteeing of interests common to the whole people, are impossible. An objective analysis shows that with the present scale of our national economy and the diversity of problems of public life, all the problems that arise cannot be resolved correctly and in good time from one center. Hence the need for many powers to be handed over to local bodies, to the republics, krays, oblasts, rayons and labor collectives.

For the moment, comrades, the situation looks like this. Not only the government, but also the CPSU Central Committee, Politburo and the Central Committee Secretariat have to resolve dozens and hundreds of questions, most of which could be passed on to lower local soviet, management, and other bodies without the least detriment to the matter. Everyone has gotten used to that order of things. Leading cadres send telegrams, with or without reason, containing various requests to the Central Committee and to the government. And citizens submit many applications regarding issues which should, in essence, be resolved on the spot, namely, in the town or the rayon and even in the village.

Naturally, the redistribution of functions, of authority is an extremely responsible matter. It cannot be left to run by itself. A strong political impulse is required here and a precise legislative basis. Carrying out decentralization that is considerable in its scale means supplying a life-giving flow of blood into the veins of our political and economic system. But it is understandable that, in so doing, in no way must the blood supply to the brain and heart of our own organism, the organism of our society, be disrupted. An important place in this belongs to the USSR Council of Ministers which is the highest executive and distributive body of power accountable to the USSR Supreme Soviet. In the context of delimiting the functions of party and state bodies, the responsibility of the Council of Ministers for implementing domestic and foreign policy, the working out and realization of plans and long-term programs for the economic, social, and cultural development increases immeasurably. In order to fulfill these functions, the Council of Ministers has at its disposal broad powers envisaged by our Constitution. While recognizing the exceptional importance of decentralization and the fight against the pursuit of narrow departmental interests, we should say clearly that they have nothing in common with encouraging parochialism. Since such a threat is quite realistic, we need serious counterbalances. The center should retain the right to have its say. The main thing is that democratic control from below, from the working people, should be resolutely strengthened. We all, I think, will vote for self-government, but against arbitrariness, for taking local interests into account, but also for them to be unfailingly combined with the interests of the whole of society. In a word, those who think that the course of decentralization is opening up the floodgates for parochialism and regional egoism are making a gross mistake.

The problems of combining centralism and decentralization in a rational way also arise in connection with the adopted Law on State Enterprises and Associations regarding cooperatives and individual labor activity. The point of departure in determining the functions of the structural bodies of management should be principles formulated in these documents. They can no longer give orders to the labor collectives as they did previously. In general, comrades, democratization on the level of the financially autonomous team, of the individual labor collective or cooperative will not provide the result it should—and we have already become convinced of this at the first stage of reform—if it is not supplemented with democratization of management on the level of ministries, territorial bodies, and central economic departments.

That means that we must consistently pursue the line of simplifying the structure, combining bodies which administer homogeneous sectors and spheres of activity, reducing the number of ministries and departments, and abolishing superfluous levels and intermediate and intermediary [peredatochnyy] structures. We all understand, comrades, that now that the exceedingly complex tasks of restructuring—democratization of society and broad involvement of the people in government—are being tackled, we cannot do without the apparat, and we must not take a disdainful attitude toward its cadres. We need the apparatus of administration, but it must be different from what it is now. We must struggle for an apparat of a new type, based on high professionalism, having a command of modern information technology, democratically controlled by the people, capable of moving economic and social progress forward. And working in that apparat, we must have people with a good knowledge of the foundations of the science of administration. Hence the task of organizing the training and retraining of the appropriate cadres in a new way and to modern standards.

The work of setting the structure of administration to rights has now begun at all levels. Some ministries and departments have been abolished in the center and in the republics, as have some administrative subdivisions in the localities. We have examined and approved new general schemes of administration. The apparat of the union departments falling within their scope has been cut by 40 percent. In the republics it is being halved. And in the autonomous republics, krays, and oblasts, it is being reduced by a third. Within the framework of the economic reform which is underway, the enterprises

have also begun to rid themselves of superfluous administrative personnel. This is not a painless process: It is meeting with resistance. But it has to be said that both the CPSU Central Committee and the government are being justly criticized by the working people for the fact that this is going too slowly. In the third year of restructuring, we are still stuck with an unwieldy administrative apparatus, a considerable part of which is fighting tooth and nail to hold on to its positions, without regard for the interests of society. And here, of course, we ought to orientate ourselves toward the entirely justified demands of the people.

In speaking of the need for a radical improvement in the efficiency of the administrative system operating in our country, it is necessary to take it as a whole. Not one of its levels can remain outside restructuring on the principles of democratic renewal. That applies in full measure to the institutions having to do with the performance of foreign political and external economic functions. The substantial transformations that have been carried out in them of late are a normal process in keeping with the spirit of the times. We must also support the purposeful work of the leadership of the State Security Committee, the Defense Ministry, and the General Staff, aimed at improving their activities in the conditions created by the present development of our society and of the unfolding of democratic processes. In a word, comrades, the process of democratization confronts us in an acute form with the task of qualitatively improving the system of administration by establishing the correct correlation between the center and the localities and between the elective and executive bodies, and of expanding in real terms the participation of the working people in government. It follows that the question cannot be reduced to purely organizational changes; and this is very important for an understanding of the nature of the work ahead.

5. The Development of Interethnic Relations [subhead]

Comrades, one of the greatest gains of socialism has been the establishment in our country of a union of equal nationalities and ethnic groups. This enables one to say today with great conviction that in the future, as in the past, the consistent pursuit of a Leninist nationalities policy can be the sole healthy basis for our development. Life has confirmed the correctness of the idea enshrined in the organization of our great union: the cumulation and combination of our efforts have made it possible for each nationality, and for society as a whole, to significantly increase the speed of their movement and attain new frontiers of historic progress.

For all the difficulties that faced us on our path, today we note that this union has stood the test of time. It continues to remain the decisive prerequisite for the further development of all our peoples. As is known, it is planned to devote a special Central Committee plenum to the development of relations between the nationalities. However, we must address this exceptionally important and topical problem right now at our conference. It is important to see the whole, real picture here, both the undoubted achievements and the obvious shortfalls, omissions, and difficulties connected with the unresolved nature of specific socioeconomic issues as well as the occasional inability to merge the interests of individual nationalities and the interests of the entire people.

We shall have to engage thoroughly in further developing and improving existing interrepublican economic and scientific-technical links and realize more fully the advantages of the division and sharing of labor within the union, and of the scientifically based regional policy. Glasnost means a lot here. The working people should be fully informed about how their republic is developing and about what place it occupies in the complex of the national economy. They must know not only how their neighbors but how all the country's republics are living and developing. This should also be done because at times one comes across conversations and judgements on interrelations between republics based on insufficient or even biased information. It would be right for our party conference to voice, in the form of reliable guidelines for relations between the nationalities in the economic sphere, support for the principles of fairness and fraternal international aid for one another, and cooperation which ensures both an overall upturn and an improvement in the economic and social living conditions of all the country's nations and ethnic groups.

In the present situation, the rights of the union republics must be reinterpreted and brought into accordance with the radical economic reform. Obviously, it is expedient that, having fulfilled their obligations vis-a-vis all-union stocks, they should be able to increase production for their own needs through skillful and enterprising management. This also would correspond to the demands of social justice in the development of relations between nationalities and would stimulate our common forward movement.

Problems that have not always been sufficiently taken into account also have had light shed on them in recent years in the process of democratization and glasnost: issues related to language, culture, literature and art, historical monuments, and the protection of nature, for example. The development of our multinational state naturally is accompanied by a growth in national self-awareness. This phenomenon is a positive one, but since due attention has not always been paid to the new needs arising in connection with it, some issues have started to grow more complex and to acquire a nationalist slant in a number of cases, although it would be possible in principle to solve them calmly, without giving cause for various sorts of speculation and emotional excesses. We recently have seen with our own eyes the knots into which the problems of relations among nationalities can get tied, and it is necessary to guard the fraternity and friendship of our peoples as the apple of our eye. Another way or a sensible alternative simply does not exist, comrades!

The person who tries to prove anything else deceives both himself and others. Moreover, trying to cause clashes between people of different nationalities, to sow discord and hatred between them, means taking upon oneself a heavy responsibility before one's own people and before socialist society, not to mention the law. Objectively, such actions hamper both the process of democratization and the cause of restructuring.

We should also look at the issues of relations between the nationalities within the context of the present stage of development of the Soviet multinational state. The experience we have built up must be generalized. Everything that is valuable must be used, and at the same time everything that has to be got rid of must be exposed. Let's be frank, there is something to think about here; first and foremost we have to assess many normative documents which regulate interaction between the Union and the republics, and see how far they correspond to present conditions, the tasks and requirements of our multinational society and its level of development and democracy. Clearly this is going to require the position, the rights and the obligations of the union and autonomous republics and the other national formations to be defined more precisely. And within the course of this approach, the following question must also be examined: Our society is distinguished by the high level of mobility of the population. Many people live outside the boundaries of their national formations, and there are ethnic groups that do not have any territorial autonomy. All these are realities of our multinational state.

Certain collisions are possible here, and we have only one way for resolving them: By ensuring, within the framework of the structure of the union state that has come into being, that the interests of every nation and ethnic group and of the whole community of Soviet peoples are taken into account to the maximum extent. Any other approach is simply impossible in our specific conditions. Any attempt to embark upon a different road would be disastrous. Let us take Kazakhstan, for example. An enormous republic, possessing great possibilities for development, a true international community, the achievements of which are the result of cooperation by all our people. That land has been mastered by Kazakhs, Russians, Ukrainians, Germans, Kirghizians, Tatars, Uzbeks, Turkmens, and representatives of many other nations and ethnic groups, and they live there together.

At the same time no one is casting doubt on the integrity of the Kazakh Republic. To some extent the same picture may also be observed in other republics. Internationalization of the economy and of all public life cannot be avoided by us, and any striving for national exclusivity can only lead to economic and spiritual impoverishment. Our socialist approach is different. We strive to see that an individual of any nationality has full rights in practice in any area of the country and that he can realize his rights and legitimate interests anywhere.

In advocating a further strengthening of internationality relations, we proceed from the position that the development of the Soviet Union state and the international ties and fraternity of our peoples are living and dynamic processes. They must be constantly within the field of view of both republican and union bodies. The problems connected with them need to be resolved by relying on the will of the peoples and mutual agreement, with account being taken of the interests of all Soviet people. It is very important that there exist within the framework of our political system on a permanent basis such state and social institutions that deal with the whole complex of internationality problems. I said earlier that this should become one of the main tasks of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Altogether, comrades, the USSR is our common home, and we, its masters, are obliged to show constant solicitude for it, to guard and embellish it and endeavor to act so that all Soviet people living in it feel pride in their socialist fatherland. (prolonged applause)

This obviously needs to be stressed particularly in the resolution of our conference on improving national relations.

6. The Formation of the Socialist Legal State [subhead]

I cannot fail to note the interest that was evoked by the proposition in the CPSU Central Committee's Theses that the process of the consistent democratization of Soviet society should bring to completion the creation of a socialist legal state. In brief, the most important thing characterizing a legal state is ensuring in practice the supremacy of the law. No state body, official, collective and party of social organization, and no individual is freed from the obligation to submit to the law. Just as the citizens bear responsibility to their state of the whole people, so does the state power bear responsibility to the citizens. Their rights must be reliably defended from any arbitrariness by the authorities and their representatives.

Restructuring has revealed with particular clarity the conservatism of our country's legal system, which to a considerable extent is oriented not to democratic and economic methods but to command and injunctior methods of leadership with their numerous prohibitions and petty regulations. Many of the existing laws have therefore become a brake on social development. This is why Soviet legislation needs to be reformed. It must encompass a great mass of legal norms and first and foremost those relating to socialist property, planning and economic, labor, tax, pension, and other relations. In the renewal of the legislation, there needs to be a strict adherence to the principle that everything is allowed which is not prohibited by the law.

The work of the judicial bodies is of enormous importance. The fate of many people, the defense of their rights, and the inescapable punishment of those who have broken the law depend on how accurately the scales of justice function. In these conditions, it is extremely

important to restore the Leninist vision of the role of the court in our system of democracy and strictly to observe the principle of the independence of judges and their subordination only to the law. The election of courts by superior soviets of people's deputies for a more prolonged period, say 10 years, could become one of the important guarantees of this. The public demands a toughening of liability for contempt of court and for interference in its work, and a guarantee of the most rigorous compliance with such democratic principles of court proceedings as competitiveness and equality of the parties, glasnost and openness, the exclusion of all bias and prejudice on the part of the prosecution, and the rigorous implementation of the principle of presumption of innocence. The question is justifiably raised of enhancing the role of the people's assessors. The proposal for increasing their number in examining the most complex category of cases is particularly worthy of attention.

Thus, we are faced, comrades, with the need for a major legal reform. Special mention must be made of the role and responsibility of the procuracy. Over the last 2 decades, a large number of supplementary commitments have been placed upon it, which one way or another have pushed its functions in supervising legality to a position of secondary or even tertiary importance. The CPSU Central Committee has recognized the need to remove this distortion, and has set the task of returning to the Leninist position and asserting as the main function of the procurators the supervision of the universal and precise understanding and application of Soviet laws.

An important condition for the intensification of the struggle against crime is the work which has been begun on amending the criminal law, and then the procedural and the corrective labor legislation, and bringing its norms into line with the needs of society at the current stage of its development. Great atatention must be paid to improving the work of the militia. Over the last 2-3 years, tens of thousands of Communists and members of the Komsomol—the representatives of the working class and the peasantry—have joined the militia on the recommendation of party committees and labor collectives. This will serve to clean up the organs of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, where, as is well known, serious disruptions are allowed to occur in their work, and, unfortunately, abuses. The main thing that should help us to resolutely raise the level of work of the militia is work with the cadres, their political education, their legal training, and enhancement of their professional skill. The proposal for transferring in the very near future the investigation of the bulk of criminal cases to the investigative apparatus of the Ministry of Internal Affairs is worthy of support, as is its detachment into a separate structure, not subordinate to the local militia organs. This will make it possible, it seems, to make better use of the possibilities of the Soviet militia in the struggle against crime and in maintaining social order.

With the aim of strengthening the defense of citizens' rights, it is legitimate to put the question of enhancing the role of the legal profession as a self-managing association, and also of lawyers taking a more active part in examining criminal and civil cases.

In connection with the changeover of our economy to the principles of economic reform, it is essential to strengthen significantly the juridical service of the soviets, ministries, departments, and economic and other organizations as well as the organs of state arbitration. In conditions of financial autonomy and self-management, when contract relations will increasingly penetrate the whole fabric of production links, reliable work by the legal services becomes of prime importance. Without this it is hard to speak of a competent solution to the mass of legal and other problems that arise during restructuring. The planned legal and court reform, the main trends of which our conference proposes to define in an individual resolution, undoubtedly needs to be well supplied with cadres. There is no getting away from working out a special program for the training or retraining of lawyers. At the same time, it is also necessary to solve the urgent questions of the material provision for legal cadres.

Universal legal education must be started at school and continued at technical colleges and colleges of higher education, at enterprises and institutions. I think that raising the material incentive and the conditions of financial autonomy themselves will to a large extent help the broad masses of workers to master the basic legal knowledge to strengthen law and order in our country.

7. Social Organizations in the Political System [subhead]

Public organizations which reflect the interests of different strata of society are an important component part of the Soviet political system. Trade unions, the Komsomol, cooperative, women's, and other organizations have played an important role in the history of socialist construction. Today too they are searching for ways to step up their activity and increase their contribution to the revolutionary renewal of society. But the restructuring of public organizations, with all their differences, is slow and painful. The habit of doing things in the old way, looking over the shoulder at party and state organs, is too strong. Both the general atmosphere in the country and a number of political decisions and legislative acts which have been adopted make it possible for public organizations to project their creative potential more energetically into the process of restructuring.

Incidentally, coming up are laws on the rights of trades unions, on youth, on voluntary societies, and on organs of public self-motivated activity and self-motivated public associations. Thus good prerequisites for the restructuring of the activities of public organizations as applicable to the new conditions have been created.

However, it is not merely a matter of decisions and legislative acts. Most important is the fact of how public organizations themselves see their role and place on the

contemporary stage. Obviously, we must have a comprehensive discussion at our conference of the problems linked to stepping up the activity of public organizations, and in this connection I should like to give voice to a few ideas.

First of all, I'll talk about the trade unions. It goes without saying that, out of respect for their independence, we should not be giving them precise recipes as to how to restructure. Moreover, there has already been talk of this at the 18th Trade Unions Congress. The most important thing is democratization of the very life of the trade union organizations and their taking into account the new situation generated by the process of a democratic renewal of society and particularly at the level of the working collectives.

A favorable outlook is now opening up for handing several functions carried out by state bodies over to the public organizations. We are right to expect the trade unions to be active champions of strengthening self-management principles. Self-management of the working collectives increases the significance of such trade union functions as the defense of the working people's democratic rights. By a more confident action in favor of democratism, the trade unions can have a considerable effect on people's frame of mind, help them to overcome inertia, and more widely involve the working people in managing the affairs of the collective and society. And, of course, the trade unions' defense of the working people's social and economic interests, primarily in the sphere of labor protection, safety technology, social insurance, and the organization of people's leisure and daily life, is in no way diminished but acquires still further significance. This means that the trade unions must find their real place and play a far more active role in implementing economic reform since it is only on this path that we can attain tangible advances in improving the living conditions of the working class and the working people as a whole. Enhancement of the role of the trade unions, like that of other public organizations, will be facilitated by their direct representation in the supreme body of state power.

We can see today how all generations of Soviet people are united around the idea of restructuring. The idea of it corresponds equally to the interests of older people, those who shouldered the burden of the first decades of socialist development, defended the country's independence in the Great Patriotic War, and raised it up in the postwar years, and those who are only just entering conscious life and who are to take our motherland to new frontiers of progress. Each generation must say its piece in our common history. All of us participate in and create it. But it is the young people in particular who are to open fully the great economic, scientific, technical, and intellectual potential that has built up over the years of Soviet power, to multiply it many times over, and implement the great aims of restructuring. And we can see that young people are more and more becoming not merely participants in the people's struggle as a whole, but its shock and innovative force.

The political and labor potential of Soviet young people is vast but liberating it to the full and channeling the energy of young people into restructuring can be done only when we have decisively overcome serious shortcomings that have occurred in our work with young people in recent decades, during which many fine-sounding words were addressed at them, but genuine steps to prepare young people for life and to involve them in society's political and economic spheres were lacking. The CPSU Central Committee approves of the correct ideas voiced on this issue by the Komsomol Central Committee and the Komsomol organizations. We believe that in contemporary conditions, the CPSU and the state should have a well-thought-out and integral policy regarding young people. At the same time, the legal, economic, and political mechanisms for implementing it should be worked out.

The purpose of this policy, as a special area of the activity of the party and of state organs, of all public organizations, is to create the conditions and incentives for young people through which they are able to develop their thinking and energies to the greatest extent, and to develop and realize their creative potential in the name of socialism. We must, in fact, demonstrate total political trust in our young people, and change the very type of relations with young people. The attitude of "fathers" instructing their "children" must give way to communicating with them, and to dialogue.

If we want to fully restore the trust of young people, we must learn to talk with them, talking with them as equals, openly, honestly, remembering meanwhile that it is only the truth that will help us. There will be as much trust as there is truth. We must teach young people to be selfless in the struggle for the achievement of our ideals; but at the same time we must create the conditions for a joyful, attractive, and full-blooded life.

In speaking of all this, comrades, I want to say clearly that the matter is not one of somehow playing up to young people, of new forms of tutelage and all-forgivingness, and that is rejected by young people themselves. No, we must build our relationship on the principles of trust, comradeship, respect, mutual exactingness, and active cooperation in tackling the tasks of renewing our socialist society.

The question of the Komsomol's role today also has immense importance in this connection. The Komsomol is the political organization of Soviet youth, working under the guidance of the party. Today as well, the main task in its work is to point out the Leninist way, to prepare young people to become communists and to take an active part in implementing the policy of the Communist Party. We all wish to see the Komsomol as a school for the communist upbringing of boys and girls, a

true school of democracy, an innovative organization where creative people with initiative can find support, where glasnost, openness in expressing one's position, and a spirit of debate are combined with the practical realization of the interests of young people and the active involvement of them in social and economic transformations.

What we are talking about is the chance for the Komsomol to carry out its work without interference, not waiting for instructions from above, but realizing to the full the potential of young energy and initative. As far as party committees are concerned, they should respect and comply with the organizational independence of the Komsomol, its right to tackle independently all issues of life [voprosy vnutrisoyuznoy zhizni] within the Komsomol without exception, and to participate in the elaboration and implementation of the party's policy, and to defend the interests of young people in party, soviet, and economic bodies. Restructuring demands that the younger generation should be broadly represented in soviets, trade unions, and other public organizations, that young people should acquire the science of management and boldly take state and public affairs into their hands.

Comrades! Before our eyes a new generation is growing and forming—the generation of restructuring. The training of the new shift is one of the most responsible tasks of our entire party and our entire society. Obviously it is such an important question that it should in the very near future also become a topic for special discussion at a plenum of the party Central Committee.

In connection with the problem of social interests, I want to dwell on another question of state significance; that is, the question of women. It has been asserted repeatedly that it has been resolved in our country once and for all. In reality we have proclaimed the equality of rights of women with men, and we have guaranteed equal access to almost all professions, established equal pay for equal work, and guaranteed other rights for women. All that is true. But things have turned out in such away that alongside the unquestionable gains, women have been left with concerns which still in many ways prevent them from making full use of their rights. The disordered state of everyday life, the shortage of institutions for children, the shortcomings of work in the services and trade sectors all fall first and foremost to the lot of women. So here the residual principle in the development of the social sphere has also had its effect. But this situation could continue for years yet, because the opinions of women have not been taken into consideration to a very great extent. They do not have the representation that they should have in the leadership organs. Indeed, on the whole the women's movement which developed after the October Revolution gradually died away or became formal in nature.

Restructuring has posed these questions in an acute way. A mass organization of women has been created, or rather revived. But this is only the organizational side of things, albeit an important one. We must try to change the situation in essence, to open up for women a broad road into the organs of leadership from the bottom to the top, to ensure that questions which touch directly upon the interests of women are not resolved without their participation and deciding judgements.

Another remarkable feature of restructuring is the stormy growth of public associations reflecting all the diversity of social interests. This includes organizations for veterans of war and labor, the Union of Scientific and Engineering Societies and Theatrical Figures, the Soviet Culture Fund, the Children's Fund, various societies engaged in the conservation of nature and historical monuments, and the charity movement. On the whole this is a remarkable manifestation of the people's independent action, and it deserves every kind of support.

Of course one should not close one's eyes to the fact that in the course of the public upsurge, individual groups have appeared whose interests are far from the aims of restructuring and the interests of the people. But it is not they who determine the general atmosphere, and it is not they who are the point now.

I believe that the party organizations, the working people, can distinguish the true enthusiasts for the renewal of socialist society from those who are guided by aims which are alien to socialism.

Under the one-party system, which has been historically created and consolidated in the country, we need a permanent mechanism for juxtaposing opinions, criticism, and self-criticism within the party and within society. In conditions of growing democratization, this is an issue of vital importance. This is precisely how the essence of internal party democracy was understood by Lenin, who, in condemning fractionalism, was resolutely opposed to persecuting his party comrades for thinking differently. Constant constructive political dialogue and the practice of discussion and study and taking account of public opinion should become integral features of our way of life. Conditions for this are being created now.

In fact, a nationwide patriotic movement for supporting the party line for restructuring is being formed in the country. It includes all forces who are in favor of making society healthier—Communists, Komsomol members, nonparty members, believers, women, veterans, young people, and representatives of all the main public organizations. This movement reflects the profound processes occurring in contemporary public and political life and strengthens confidence in the success of the cause of perestroyka. Various proposals are being expressed at meetings, gatherings, and in the press about the prospects for this movement, the possible forms its activity could take. Let us discuss this question also.

III. Democratization of the CPSU's Leading Activity and Internal Life [section subhead]

Comrades, in implementing perestroyka we again and again turn our thoughts to the party, to its position and

role in this revolutionary process. It is significant that it is precisely issues which concern the activity of the party and its leading role that have been at the center of our society's attention recently. And this is one of the most convincing confirmations that the people associate both the progress of perestroyka and their hopes for the future with the party.

Even purely internal party problems have become the object of general popular interest. Having proposed a new course in April 1985, the CPSU has confirmed that none but itself is the bearer of society's program targets. It is precisely the party that is the political force that can lead the country along the path of renewal. Boldly revealing the reasons for the pre-crisis situation and the stagnation phenomena, the party has taken responsibility for the situation which has been created. It has examined its activity objectively, its methods of leadership, and consciously provoked public criticism of itself.

At the 27th CPSU Congress, and particularly at the January 1987 Central Committee plenum, the negative processes occurring in the last decades—not only in society as a whole but also in the party itself—were subjected to critical analysis. We had to give an answer to questions of principle: Why was it that the CPSU, created as a truly democratic organization—of one flesh with the working people—did not manage to stand in the way of the processes of deformation of socialism connected with Stalin's cult of personality? Why also, after that, having exposed and condemned the departures from Leninist principles, did it limit itself to superficial changes, as a result of which serious stagnation phenomena were allowed to occur in the country's develpoment?

The answer lies above all in the fact that certain deformations occurred within the party itself, in the content of its activity and ties with the working people. This brought the loss of many democratic Bolshevik traditions which were inherent in it from the outset and which had been instilled through many y .rs of effort by Lenin and by his comrades-in-arms.

The 27th CPSU Congress posed the task of radically restructuring party work and set the aim of democratizing intraparty life. Lessons from truth have prompted the growth of self-awareness and self-purification in our ranks. Communists, party organizations, and the party press have assumed a more active role in society; to pose and resolve outstanding issues in a bolder way.

The process of renovation—not easily and not without difficulties though—grows. But having established truly profound changes in the life of the party we would not have been sufficiently open if we did not say that as yet not everything as yet goes well. Not every party organization restructures its work taking into acount new requirements. Some party workers, and even committees, are speaking from conservative positions. Many are finding difficult the art of mastering new work methods, the ability to act in an atmosphere of glasnost and democracy. Yes, this is so, but I want to tell conference delegates and the whole people the main thing: without the directing work of the party and the implementation of its political course, the tasks of restructuring cannot be resolved. (tumultuous applause) Restructuring will be doomed politically, ideologically, and organizationally.

At the present crucial stage, the CPSU should completely fulfill its functions and tasks as the guiding force in society, but it is precisely the decisive significance of political leadership that dictates the need to discuss thoroughly the specific content of party activity in the present conditions.

1. To Revive Internal Party Democracy in Full [subhead]

What is the main thing here? The CPSU Central Committee's principled position is set out in the Theses. I shall refresh your memory: "The party, proceeding from Marxist-Leninist teaching, is destined to develop theories and strategies for social development, domestic and foreign policies, to develop the ideology of socialist renovation, to conduct political and organizational work among the masses, and to train and place cadres."

The functions of the CPSU as the political vanguard have been defined by us. But in order to put those functions into practice, the party must restructure its activities, the style, methods and forms of work, from a primary organization up to the Central Committee.

Each Communist must really fight to implement policy and fight for the interests of the people. And here it is important to try to understand why we are dissatisfied with ourselves and why we are being very sharply critical of the state of affairs in our party home.

What has happened here? The point is primarily that the principle of democratic centralism which lies at the basis of the CPSU's structure and activity was largely replaced at a certain stage by bureaucratic centralism. And this happend in the first place because the primary party organizations and the rank and file Communists to a large extent lost effective opportunities to influence the content of the party's activity. There was serious violation of the very important Leninist demand in accordance with which all party bodies and their cadres should be constantly monitored by the party masses.

Many negative phenomena in the party are also connected with the weakening of the role of the elected bodies and the excessive growth in the role of the apparatus at all levels. There is something else, too, which must not be left unmentioned. Our party was built by Lenin as an organization of like-minded people. A law of its life was the free discussion of all problems and unity of action after a decision had been taken. However,

with the establishment of the command and administrative system, the atmosphere of party comradeship gradually gave way to relations based on orders being given and carried out, to the division of party members into superiors and subordinates, to the violation of the principle of equality among Communists. And although the intolerability of the situation was recognized from time to time, in real life everything continued to go on in the same way. Let us recall that the October 1964 Central Committee plenum was held essentially under the slogan of restoring the Leninist principles and norms of party life. But the actual processes went a different way and, in the years of stagnation, at times even became deformed.

The activity of primary party organizations and of members of elected bodies was affected by delays in the process of replacing cadres. Entire generations of Communists were unable to play a real part in the life of the party. The other side of this is that many of those who remained for years in leading positions considered themselves to be infallible and irreplaceable.

The lowering of the responsibility of a large proportion of elected officials and the party apparatus, their loss of contact with the party masses and the working people frequently ended, as we now know, with political and moral degradation. These are the roots of the shameful facts of abuse of power and moral degeneration discovered during restructuring. I speak of these phenomena with bitterness. They had a serious effect on the activity of the party and of its organizations. We must never forget this aspect of the matter. But there is another aspect of this, too, and one which is very fundamental for us.

During all of these years, millions of party members and thousands of party cadres honorably fulfilled their party and civic duty in conditions which were both objectively and subjectively difficult. They worthily bore the banner of the revolution and did everything possible in their fields for the development of the country and for socialism.

This can also be said of many of our leading cadres, economic planners and experts, scientists, and cultural figures. Leninist traditions ran deep in the party environment. In spite of everything, it was precisely in the party that there accumulated and took shape forces which have turned out to be capable of making a sharp turn in socioeconomic policy and embarking on the road of restructuring and renewal. The Central Committee April plenum spoke up resolutely for democratization of the CPSU, for the openness of its work, for full restoration of the Leninist norms of party life, and first of all of the activity of the primary party organizations in the work of the party's elected bodies.

The ideas expressed regarding this in the Central Committee Theses have provoked lively discussion not only in the party but in society as a whole. All Soviet people have an interest in seeing in each Communist, in every primary party organization, in the party committee, a really dynamic political force. In the discussion on the eve of the conference, the questions of the role of party assemblies, of the forms of activity of party organizations and party committees, of each Communist, were posed in a new way. And this is understandable, for the primary party organizations are precisely an organic part of each labor collective, embodying the continual presence of the party in the life of society. For these aims it is necessary to fully revive in the party an atmosphere of principle-mindedness, openness, discussion, criticism and self-criticism, conscientious discipline, party comradeship, and an unconditional personal responsibility and businesslike character. It is in this direction that processes in party organizations are now unfolding, and it is the task of the conference to resolutely support them, and to open unlimited scope for them.

It is now necessary to pose in a new way the question of each Communist's responsibility for the state of affairs where he works, for his personal contribution to restructuring, for the activity of his collective. This is important, furthermore, because many people have been complaining that restructuring has not reached the primary party organizations. But who is to blame for that? Lets investigate: The political line of restructuring was defined and approved by the congress. The most important directions of work were formulated in the decisions of the Central Committee plenums. Legislative bills were adopted regarding various spheres of life. In the party and in society an atmosphere of glasnost was created. Initiative, independence, and a civic position are being welcomed and encouraged. Many Communists, Komsomol members, and nonparty members are acting vigorously, at the call of conscience, in various sections of the struggle for socialist renewal. But the others are waiting for something. It is the old endemic disease at work: They are waiting for instructions. Well, there are indeed instructions, comrades, but it is not fitting to lead Communists by the hand. It is in precisely this connection that the question, raised in the Theses, of holding a kind of review of party ranks, is of urgent significance.

Now, action is demanded of every one of us, real action toward carrying out the tasks of restructuring. The vanguard role of the Communists today must be proved, comrades, through deeds.

The Central Committee has called for the certification of sociopolitical competence of Communists, and we have in principle sensed an approving attitude to this proposal. It is true, however, that misgivings have also been expressed, what is more of a two-fold kind. Some believe that, certification will not yield anything, that we need, so they say, a purge of the party, to rid it of ballast. We in the Central Committee regard this approach as unwarranted under conditions of restructuring and democratization, and this is why: Many of those who not so long ago were regarded as not very active and as having lost contact with the party organization, and who were included in that ballast, are now trying to find their place

in life. We must treat our party comrades with extreme respect. Not one honest worker should be left overboard in restructuring. Let us proceed from this. This is in accordance with Lenin, in accordance with Bolshevism.

Other comrades are afraid in case certification should turn into reprisals, into the settling of accounts precisely with those who today are demonstrating their active stand. It does not suit a certain group of persons who are pursuing egotistic interests. I think that if we treat this serious matter seriously, both the former and the latter misgivings will be in vain. By putting forward the idea of the self-cleansing of the party, we reckon on certification being in line with the statute regulations, in the framework of a normal democratic process, at open party meetings, and not with the participation of any special "threesomes" or "fivesomes," and not on the basis of secret investigations and the compiling of closed references. The very process of certification should be a school for the education of Communists, so that, having passed through this school, they come out tightly welded by the bonds of party comradeship, united by the common goals and tasks which restucturing has placed before all of us.

Another question, and a very essential question, is admittance to the party. We need to rid ourselves decisively of all kinds of prearranged instructions and bureaucratic approaches to this question which is so vitally important for the party. The main criterion in appraising the qualities of someone entering the party is his position and real participation in restructuring. This requirement must apply to all—workers, peasants and representatives of our intelligentsia alike. We are all well aware that people can best be seen in their labor collective; that is where those who are going into the party at the prompting of their heart and those who are seeking personal advantage can be distinguished.

A proposal is being made, that the best people should be nominated to the party directly by the labor collectives. Experience confirms the expediency of preliminary discussion of applications for admittance to the party at working people's meetings, and of course the opinion of the collective should be attentively examined by Communists in admitting people to membership of the CPSU.

Now, about the party's elected bodies. Here we must change much, and in a radical fashion at that. First of all the authority of the elected bodies must be restored as plenipotentiary representatives of Communists. Secretaries, the bureaus and the party apparatus especially must all be under the supervision of the elected party body. Henceforth the situation must never arise in which members of the bureaus or workers of the party apparatus permit themselves a command style in relation to members of the elected committees.

It is no less important and perhaps even more important, that the biggest questions of principle connected with implementing of the vanguard role of the party in new conditions and of organizational and political work among the masses should be submitted for discussion at party committees.

The practice in which the agendas of party meetings, of Communists, are cluttered up with dozens of petty, insignificant matters has to be resolutely stopped. In the preparation and discussion of issues, the merest hint of overorganization, glorification, and empty verbiage must be excluded. Openness, a critical approach, and a business-like attitude must reign supreme in all elected organs. The same things should also be inherent in the activity of the party apparatus, which excludes secrecy in its work and the unjustified suppression of information.

Everything I have said applies in full measure to the activity of the CPSU Central Committee, which occupies a special position in the party and in society. It is precisely here that highly important issues of domestic and foreign policy are solved in the periods between congresses. How the Central Committee works, what issues it discusses, what decisions it makes, and how democratic is the atmosphere of its activity are of enormous importance for the whole party and our entire society.

We have already had occasion, at the January plenum of the Central Committee, to discuss what the situation was like in the Central Committee over a number of years. I will not repeat it; I will just say that many blunders could have been avoided if the problems that came to a head in governing the country had been solved in good time and in a well-considered manner, and if the work of the party Central Committee had always been full-blooded and democratic. The situation has begun to change now, especially since the 27th party congress. I would say this: the Central Committee is reviving and gaining strength, and Central Committee plenums now take place in a different style. Yet, we still must be cautious in our assessments and not fall into exaggerations.

Problem number one is the active work of the Central Committee members not only at their place of work but also during the preparation, discussion, and adoption of all-party decisions. Speaking of this, I also have a definite experience in mind. On the eve of the most recent plenums it became the practice to hold preliminary consultations with members of the Central Committee and with secretaries of party committees, to distribute documents relating to the agenda, and so on. All of this had an effect on the vigor of the Central Committee members themselves, and on the quality of the decisions adopted. Here, incidentially, is a definite guarantee against mistakes in work; the price of such mistakes, as is well known, is too high.

We have to think also about new forms of work organization in the periods between plenums, and at the plenums themselves. Shouldn't we have commissions in the Central Committee dealing with areas of major importance in domestic and foreign policy, and on which members of the Central Committee would work on a regular basis?

Then the party apparatus, too, will take up its proper place.

The participation by the Central Committee members in the Politburo's work must probably also be widened. I won't say that this is not happening but, so far, this participation is restricted, to a considerable extent, to officials in the apparatus, departments, and scientific institutions of the capital.

The reporting back of information about its activities by the Politburo to the Central Committee plenums must become a regular feature.

In order for the party committees and elective bodies to function in a full-blooded way and for them to be able to use everything that is enshrined in our rules, the procedure for forming them should resolutely be renewed. This is a decisive factor for the involvement of any elective body, also including a party body.

It is necessary that elections at all levels take place in a democratic atmosphere, ensuring a wide discussion of the nominations, competitiveness, and, as a result, the election of people who are really dedicated to the cause, talented and worthy people who enjoy absolute authority and are capable of pursuing the policy of restructuring.

We will evidently not succeed in achieving this by using the old approaches when nominations for possible discussion and then voting upon were essentially put forward by the secretary, at best with the participation of the members of bureau of the oblast, town, or rayon party committee, and so forth.

In connection with this, comrades, the following thought is being submitted for examination by the conference: While leaving the last word to the general meeting or the delegates of the conference, the right of lower-ranking organizations at the same tir as electing delegates to the conference or the congress, to put forward proposals regarding nominations to the higher-ranking party body should also be recognized.

As the discussion has shown, the majority resolutely supported the proposal to the effect that during elections to all party committees, right up to the CPSU Central Committee, Communists are entitled to nominate more candidates than there are mandates and to be guided in this not by what post is held by a person but by his stance on restructuring.

Had such a procedure applied, the questions which took place in a number of cases during the election of delegates to our conference would not have arisen.

The proposal to establish a single 5-year term of office for all party committees, to limit the tenure of elected CPSU posts to two terms in succession, and to permit the election for a third term only in exceptional cases has attracted universal attention. The interest in this is not fortuitous. In it was manifested the anxiety both of Communists and nonparty members regarding the violations perpetrated in the past connected with lengthy tenure in leading posts. In principle, as we understand it, three points of view have appeared here. Some comrades support the proposal contained in the Theses. Others are in favor of limiting tenure in elective posts at all levels of the party to two successive terms. And, finally, yet others speak for making an exception for the election for a third successive term only for the highest echelon.

Well, comrades, let us consult together once again and make a decision.

2. Delimitation of the Functions of Party and State Organs [subhead]

Of enormous importance in today's conditions for the interpretation of the role of the party as a political vanguard is the correct deciding of the question of the precise delimitation of the functions of the party and state bodies. The position of the CPSU Central Committee on this matter is set out in the Theses and has aroused very keen discussion. And no wonder: On the solution of this question depend, in effect, both the restructuring of our political system and the success of restructuring as a whole.

Why am I saying this with such definiteness? Our society is at a very crucial stage. It has begun a process of profound transformations, and it stands in greater need than ever before of reliable political and ideological reference points. The elaboration of such reference points, the strategy of social development and its embodiment in policy, are tasks that can be performed only by a strong party possessing a vast potential of theory and of cadres-closely linked with the people, and constantly checking and enriching its experience by the experience of the masses of the people. Vladimir Ilyich Lenin pointed out many times how harmful it is to imagine that the ruling party must lead directly, ignoring or claiming to be a substitute for other organizations of the working people. He demanded that "we distinguish much more precisely the functions of the party (and its Central Committee), and of Soviet power." He sharply criticized attempts to shift onto the party the responsibility for solving every specific problem. He condemned the practice of "dragging some small specific matter as far as the Politburo."

It is necessary to say that the issue of the demarcation of functions between party and state has been raised more than once, at various stages of the history of our society, and that when it has been raised, it has been acknowledged that the existing situation was abnormal and must be changed by appealing to Leninist principles. Yet matters not only did not change for the better, but worsened increasingly over the years. As the problems of economic development increased in complexity, the party found itself drawn into solving a great variety of administrative tasks, and its apparatus grew accordingly. The logic of the administrative and command system dictated that such a practice should be retained and reinforced. More than that, there were those who, by reference to the experience of particular stages of our history, sought to prove that this was the most effective way to solve various problems of our development. It was with them that the thesis of the growth of the leading role of the party was primarily associated.

I think you will agree, comrades, that in tackling the problem of the demarcation of functions, we must begin with the upper echelons of the country's leadership. I have already spoken about enhancing the role of the highest organs of state power and government. But what is the implication of this for the party, its Central Committee, and the Politburo of the Central Committee? Above all, it presupposes that the Central Committee and Politburo must act and function as organs of political leadership. And of course we must resolutely set a course toward not allowing substitutes for the supreme organs of power and government. Everything that the USSR Supreme Soviet and the USSR Council of Ministers must do, must be done precisely by them.

The question arises: What mechanism and what possibilities should the Central Committee and its Politburo employ in order to carry through the organs of Soviet power the political line elaborated by the party and the decisions of the congresses and plenums of the Central Committee? Here we must fully realize the Leninist principle that the CPSU carries out its political course through the Communists working in the organs of state power in all spheres of the life of society. All party organizations must act strictly within the framework of the USSR Constitution and Soviet laws. We must exclude the passing of resolutions of party committees containing direct instructions to state and economic bodies and public organizations.

Apropos of increasing the role of the elective colleges and of delimiting the functions of the party and state bodies, the issue of change in the structure and composition of the party apparatus has moved onto a practical plane. We shall have to reject the present fragementation of the CPSU Central Committee apparatus—and the corresponding fragmentation of the apparatus of subordinate party bodies—right across the branches of administration, and rearrange its structure in accordance with the functions of the party in the contemporary conditions, as well as reducing the size of the apparatus, too.

I should particularly like to speak about the rayon and city links of the party. Their role always has been and remains a very important one. While taking account of the new requirements, one must be attentive toward the formation of their apparatus so that it might better assist the party committees to carry out their direct political, organizational, and educative functions. The raykoms and gorkoms must operate on the basis of the main thing: to rely constantly on the primary party organizations in all their work. For this there must be a decisive change in the style and methods of their activities. Evidently, taking into account the discussion at the conference and the formation of our common stance on these issues, we could in the very near future set about drawing up a new structure for the party apparatus.

Comrades, the goal of all these proposals is consistent observance of the democratic principles of intra-party life; an increase in the party's militancy and in its capacity to head the process of the revolutionary renovation of Soviet society, and to set the tone for restructuring. In general, we are saying that the party's capacity for self-control and critical analysis of its actions depends first and foremost on how fully the principle of democratic centralism, the collectiveness and collegiality of its work, and glasnost are enshrined in its activity.

And something else, comrades: We are calculating that in this way we will inflict a decisive defeat on bureaucratism—the disease that has, most unfortunately, affected a sizeable proportion of party bodies and party cadres and that is expressed in their alienation from the working people and in the fact that they are ceasing to live by the interests and cares of the people. Of course, there is no single remedy—nor can there be—to resolve all problems at a stroke. We must keep firmly and consistently to the path of reviving the Leninist principles for intra-party life.

In this connection I would like to speak about control and auditing work in the party. As is shown by discussion, there is support for the proposal contained in the CPSU Central Committee Theses on the creation of a unified control and auditing body that would be elected by the party congress and that would keep an eye on the observance by Communists of the requirements of party discipline, the CPSU Constitution, and the financial and economic activity of the party organizations.

Through Revolutionary Restructuring To a New Face of Socialism [subhead]

Comrades, the February plenum of the Central Committee set the task of renovating our ideology together with radical economic reform and democratization of party and public life. And this emphasizes the active role which the party assigns to ideological work in attaining the goals of restructuring. The retreat from the principles of creative Marxism-Leninism has left a painful mark on ideology. Its theoretical level has waned, and propaganda has, not infrequently, run counter to the realities

of life. In essence, ideological work has come to serve the dogmatic concepts of socialism, has lost its critical attitude toward present-day reality, and has thus promoted manifestations of stagnation. While bypassing the topical problems of life, propaganda has degenerated into rhetorical idle talk and eulogy, and has acquired a purely ritual significance. The loss of intellectual initiative, dogmatism, and the divergence of words and deeds have led to a weakening of the party's ideological influence.

The last 3 years have been marked by intensive work in public awareness. An honest and critical discussion on the state of affairs in all fields of our life was held. Indeed, for the first time in very many years, decades even, we took a look at ourselves, not only frankly and without preconception, but in relations to all sides of our development. Once again the search for right and truth and not advantage, is honored. Once again it is boldness of objective research and not a passing fad, which is valued. Here is an instructive conclusion for all of us for the future. Without the truth of life, without scientific truths and artistic discoveries, there is not and cannot be a complete and varied spiritual life, there is not and cannot be truly effective militant ideological work. The party is convinced of the correctness of this approach, the rightness of its revolutionary initiative in developing glasnost, democracy, and the socialist pluralism of opinion. But it would be naive to suppose that a society, renewed through and through, will be born of its own accord, automatically, and all at once just because of moral purification, well founded criticism, and a break with the unworthy past. No, the dialectics of consciousness and practice are immeasureably more complicated. The effectiveness of ideological activity depends to a decisive extent on concrete political, organizational, and socioeconomic conditions. Today we have managed to arouse public consciousness, to overcome the state of apathy and alienation, and now the question is this: Where will all this awakened consciousness go? In which direction will public opinion develop? Will it either serve the cause of restructuring, go down the path of increasing constructive and creative efforts, the path of labor and responsibility, the path of the true renewal of socialist society, or will it tremble at the difficulty and unfamiliarity of the new tasks, give in to passions and emotions, break away into superficially attractive initiatives, into various short-lived campaigns. Or will it give a brief sigh over their life and slip back into slumber, which would suit excellently well all those who liked the time of stagnation.

It is clear that there can only be one path of progress. It is the path of restructuring, the path of renewal. The party will make use of all possibilities to see that public awareness is formed on the basis of the development of democratization and glasnost, and be aimed at creative work. [applause]

The cause of renewal needs guarantees and protection. These guarantees must be created and strengthened both in the consistent conducting of radical economic reform, the reform of the political system, and in the sphere of public consciousness and spiritual and ideological life. There is no doubt that quite a lot of saddening and even tragic things have been said in the past years, things which can cause bitterness, pain, disappointment, and disagreement. Of course it is pleasanter not to know this, not to be aware of it. But revolutionary awareness, a civic position, courage and lofty responsibility in a person that is essential to the success of restructuring cannot be born from such an approach. This is essential for the success of restructuring. It was precisely because of this that the party embarked boldly on a critical reconsideration of the past, on the reestablishment of historical truth, the rehabilitation of those who were the victims of unjust political accusations and lawlessness. And this work must be continued.

There should be no questions which one would avoid answering. There should be no doubts which one could brush aside. Our party honor and conscience are involved, the intellectual dignity of the party of Lenin.

It is not simple and easy to work one's way through to the truth. But a party that lives in conditions of ideological comfort, that has deduced that it has the truth in its hands and that it is not necessary to go after it day in and day out but that it can be simply taken out of the safe—such a party runs the risk of losing its intellectual [dukhovnyy] and moral authority, its revolutionary nature and the ability to be society's political vanguard.

Numerous remarkable qualities are inherent in our social consciousness, in the Soviet man. This is so. Nevertheless, today we pose the question of the need to inculcate purposefully initiative-taking, independence, lively interest in the new, the need for it. Without it, new frontiers of restructuring cannot be reached. These qualities can only be inculcated on the basis of democratic forms of life of society. Restructuring has brought to the forefront of life glasnost, which takes the most different forms in the process of its implementation: in the work of state and public organizations, at assemblies, meetings, scientific and creative conferences, citizens' rallies.

The media today are a powerful mouthpiece of public opinion. They have done quite a lot to restore the historic truth and justice, to voice criticism of shortcomings and omissions, to spread the experience of restructuring, to develop in people the ability to think and act in a new way, creatively, purposefully.

But now we must go further. We need a new quality of the party press, a new quality of its politically educational and organizational role. Our press now should, without lowering the level of criticism of all that impedes progress on the path of restructuring, go deep into the processes, analyze the complex dialectics, the contradictory nature of establishing a new society in all spheres of its life. And to achieve that, more knowledge, more competence, more constructiveness and responsibility

are needed. The press can resolve that task only through engaging wide layers of the society, through hailing the experience of real foremen of restructuring.

Today there is no more need to argue that there can be no restructuring without glasnost. Without it we would have been unable to do the great amount of work on analyzing the reasons for negative phenomena and ways of overcoming them. We would have been unable to create a new moral and political atmosphere in the society, to bring the ideas of restructuring to the forefront. Glasnost means pluralism of opinion on any issues of domestic and foreign policy, free collation of different points of view, debates. And only with that approach can it fulfill its social role: to serve the interests of the people and socialism.

But glasnost, like any manifestation of democracy, assumes high responsibility. Glasnost cannot be combined with claims to a monopoly on views, with the imposition of different dogmas to replace those we are rejecting, with the serving of group interests and even less with distortion of facts and with the settling of personal scores.

It is extremely antidemocratic to deprive people who have been subjected to criticism of the means to respond to the essence of it. What sort of glasnost is that? And it is completely unacceptable when discussions, meetings, pages of the press, and television screens are used for wrangling, hurling insults, and labeling. (applause)

At the same time, comrades, there are still instances—and this must be plainly stated at the conference—of suppression and even reprisals for criticism. We also meet with this in party organizations, in labor collectives, in public organizations, and in the management apparatus, and with regard to the mass media. Quite often, the active and uncompromising way Soviet people expose specific shortcomings—their protests against routine and irresponsibility, against abuses by officials—arouses a furious response and opposition from some people. And once more we see how they silence and even persecute those who raise their voices to defend the truth. Party organizations and party committees at all levels must guard the development of criticism and self-criticism and must act from positions of principle.

When we speak, comrades, of instilling political culture and civilization in human relations, our mass media can play an enormous role here, including by their own example. All this must obviously be kept in mind in preparing the conference resolution on glasnost.

And on another ideological aspect of the party's political activity at the present stage of perestroyka—now, the processes of reestablishing truth and justice, rejecting everything that has deformed socialist ideology and practice, and abolishing stereotypes and dogmas—some people insist that these are allegedly an erosion of principles, of the bases of socialism, a denigration of its history. We cannot agree with this, comrades. Categorically, we cannot!

We do not have the right to allow perestroyka to stumble on the stone of dogmatism and conservatism, on someone's prejudices and personal ambitions. It is a matter of the country's destiny, the destiny of socialism, and we are obliged to clarify the acute nature of the situation to those who have not yet grasped it. In this matter, which is a most important one for us, there can be no compromises.

I would like to state quite clearly here at the conference that we will continue to develop all genuinely socialist values, and decisively eliminate everything that has distorted the revolutionary theory and aspect of socialism. Tempestuous discussions and battles of passions have revealed an important situation, both gratifying and inspiring. It confirms with new force, after so many trials, dramatic situations, and tragic falls, the correctness of the historic choice made by our people in 1917—the choice in favor of socialism.

Look how everyone can now speak his mind and say what he wants. And this multiplicity of opinions, judgements, and emotions finds expression in public life on an unprecedented scale and under the most various guises. And what has happened? Without pretending or wishing to embellish, we can say that despite all the acuteness and critical nature of judgements heard over this period the Soviet people has, in the process of perestroyka, once more voted decisively and strongly for socialism.

Yes, we are renouncing everything which deformed socialism in the thirties and which led it into stagnation in the seventies. We want the sort of socialism which is cleansed of the deposits and distortions of earlier periods but which, at the same time, is the successor to all the best born of the creative thinking of the founders of our teaching and which has been embodied in life by the labor and efforts of the people and which reflects their hopes and aspirations. We want a socialism which absorbs all the advanced experience of world development and which is based to the full on the achievements of human progress.

Of course, it is not possible today to describe in every detail the specific features of the society toward which we are traveling through restructuring. But it is possible and necessary to outline the basic parameters and main features of what we call a qualitatively new state of society. It is possible because the main directions and tendencies of the transformation of society have already emerged. It is necessary because, apart from criticism of revealed shortcomings and the understanding of what we should renounce, there is an equally great demand for constructive and positive reference points to show the way and the means to bring practice closer to the ultimate aims and ideals of socialism.

We see socialism as a system of genuine and real humanism in which man is really the "measure of all things." The whole development of society, starting with its economy and ending with the spiritual and ideological sphere, is aimed at satisfying the requirements of man and at his all-round development. And all of this is done by the labor, creativeness, and energy of the people themselves.

We see socialism as a system with an efficient and dynamic economy based on the best achievements of scientific-technical progress and ensuring the highest level of labor productivity, an economy directly subordinated to satisfying the demands of society and flexibly adapting to it.

Such an economy is based on varied forms of public and personal property, the organization of production in such a way as to ensure that the working people are the real masters of production and that earnings are directly linked with the results of one's labor. The planned management of the economy is based on the organic combination of the role of the center in resolving structural questions with broad independence of production units as the producers of goods acting on the basis of financial autonomy and independence and working for the market.

We see socialism as a system of social justice, combining social guarantees of man's vital requirements of work, health protection, education, housing, and social security with the consistent implementation of the principle of distribution according to one's work, with the eradication of any forms of excessive levelling and social parasitism. It is a society which values man's material and moral abilities, his fruitful labor, skill, and talent above everything else and which gives a worthy reward for this.

We see socialism as a highly cultured and moral system. It inherits and multiplies the best achievements of the spiritual development of mankind and its rich moral experience. It is a society where the man of labor enjoys a full-blooded and rich life in the material and spiritual sense, one which rejects consumerism, lack of spirituality, and cultural primitivism. The concept of a high standard of culture includes also the ecological standards of society and a careful and sensible approach to the natural conditions of the life and production activity of people, and the preservation and multiplication of natural wealth. We see socialism also as a system of genuine sovereignty of the people in which all working people are guaranteed full oppportunity to express their needs and interests, to participate in the management of social processes, and to overcome the alienation of man from power.

This is a society of the socialist self-management of the people, of profound and consistent democratism in economic management, social processes, legality, openness, and glasnost. We see socialism as a system of the genuine equality of all nations and nationalities, their social and spiritual flourishing and mutual enrichment, where there is no room for any display of dissension between the nationalities, nationalistic and chauvinistic prejudices, where internationalism and fraternity of nations triumph.

Lastly, we see socialism as a system whose nature and interests are organically characterized by the striving for peace, for strengthening cooperation and interaction with the fraternal socialist countries, establishment of normal civilized relations between all peoples and states on the basis of democratic principles of equality of rights, noninterference in each other's affairs, and recognition of the sovereign right of peoples to determine their own fate themselves. And we have in mind precisely this kind of democratic, human face of socialism when talking about the qualitatively new situation in our society, as an important step in the movement toward communism.

The coming years will determine our country's future and the fate of the Soviet system. For us, this future will be as created by us; we will have to do it ourselves; nobody will do it for us or instead of us. This is how the question is put, and we are obliged to provide a direct answer to it without omissions and reticence, without attempts to evade honest comparison of the desirable and the actual words and deeds, of subjective ideas and objective realities. The Soviet people want clear prospects, full-blooded and unconditional democracy, legality without exception, glasnost in everything, big and small, fraternity and comradeship in relations, respect for industriousness and talent, faithful service to the cause and to public duty. We do not need social utopias, but we need clear reference points, objective criteria of socialist spirit in all stages of the changes so that the trends of social development are clearly visible, so that they are not overwhelmed by petty detail and ostentation, as happened often in the past.

We are convinced of the vitality of Marxist-Leninist teaching, which laid the foundations scientifically for the opportunity to build a society of social justice and a civilization of free people with equal rights. This is what guides us during the process of revolutionary restructuring, and this is how we shall act at its new and most important stage, which our party conference opens.

Comrades! In concluding my report, I would like to speak in general terms about the debate which preceded the conference and which became particularly lively following the publication of the Central Committee Theses. It is a long time since there has been such a broad, passionate, and fruitful debate within the party and in society, one with lively thought, a great number of proposals, and at times, acute clash of opinions.

At the center of it were essentially the main questions of restructuring—the democratization of public life and life within the party. The debate was virtually about one thing—how best to do this.

One can clearly say that the proposals and ideas which the Central Committee has brought to the conference were born of the collective thought of the party and all the people. Our aims are more democracy, more socialism, a better life for the man of toil, the greatness and good of the country.

Over these days we are to sum up the results of the work carried out in the name of achieving these aims, to adopt documents of vast importance, which should give a new impetus to restructuring and to make it irreversible. It is precisely this which determines the level of responsibility of each delegate and of our whole conference to the party and the Soviet people. (prolonged applause)

Bakatin Opens Debate

PM3006145188 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Jun 88 Morning Edition p 2

["Speech by Comrade V.V. Bakatin, first secretary of Kemerovo CPSU Obkom," at the 28 June afternoon session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference, under general heading "Discussion of the Report 'On the Course of Implementing the 27th CPSU Congress Decisions and Tasks in Deepening Restructuring'"]

[Text] Esteemed Comrades! Of course, it is very difficult to begin the debate after that kind of report. I think you realize what an emotional state I am in. But I must say that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev is absolutely right in what he said, literally a few minutes ago from this rostrum, about the features of the life of our party and our entire society during the period of preparation for the conference.

The main feature (we are also of this opinion and take pride in the fact that our opinions coincide—it should not be otherwise) is the unprecedented activeness and interest among Communists and all working people and everyone's—literally everyone's—concern that their proposals should reach our hall. Our Kuzbass delegation—and we have agreed that this is our common speech—has thought long and hard about how to inform you of all 75,000 proposals from Kuzbass Communists and nonparty members. We also consulted obkom members a great deal and saw that it was not so easy to generalize all this. But it turned out that by and large the report removed all our questions and answered all our doubts and it seems possible, so to say, to end my speech here. (applause) It is very difficult for me to speak. But at the same time there is nothing surprising in this, probably because the report is also the fruit of collective reason and relies on the collective experience of the entire party and the entire people. But all the same allow me to say a few words about the proposals which I was tasked with putting forward here from this rostrum.

Indisputably, the ideas of restructuring, proclaimed for the first time at the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum, have now changed themselves in many respects and have also changed the life of our country in many respects. Changes are under way. This is quite obvious to every unbiased person. The issue is quite different: How can these changes be gauged? Everyone gauges them subject to his understanding of restructuring. But any yardsticks based on a petit-bourgeois, consumerist attitude to socialism, whatever global claims they may make, will nonetheless remain petty yardsticks. Most workers in Kuzbass collectives—miners, metallurgists, chemical workers, and construction workers—gauge restructuring not by the degree of an individual's freedom of self-expression, regardless of his degree of responsibility for the matter in hand, but directly by action, nothing but action, action alone. It must be said that the working class does not fuss, does not show signs of impatience, and understands that restructuring is not a one-shot act but a great work and a great responsibility.

At the same time it is becoming clear why changes in the economy—and this is our most essential policy—are taking place more slowly than the bold political decisions adopted would apparently allow. Today it is not lack of glasnost that is an obstacle but indeterminateness, timidity, and in some places the deliberate braking action applied by central organs and enterprise leaders to the implementation of the ideas of the CPSU Central Committee June (1987) Plenum.

We wholly and completely concur with the speech's conclusion that enterprises have not been unshackled from the center. Only the first step has been taken, the conditions have been created to some extent, and the process of the democratization of management within enterprises is under way. This is good, but it is only half the matter, and that is why the effect is incomplete. It is time to switch from democratization of enterprise management to democratization of sector management. A whole series of options could be put forward here. We may and probably should demand the fundamental restructuring of the work of ministries and other management organs and even more decisive cuts in their apparatus. The report mentioned this today.

We can also support the path of creating large-scale, intersector territorial complexes—this would be wholly and completely suited to the Kuzbass—dealing directly with the government, which would lead to the gradual disappearance of some ministries, but only some, mind you. However, this cannot happen all at once, it needs time and we need to resolve economic tasks more rapidly. It seems that we must do something quite easy as a first step: We must stop burdening enterprises with state orders and reduce state orders.

It is important for each enterprise in 1989 to have some proportion of its capacities completely at its disposal. The execution of a state order must indisputably be compulsory. But the state order must also be less than the enterprise plan and less than the enterprise's capacities. We must not be afraid of this. Definitely not. This may even lead to a reduction in loadings on capacities, since it must be admitted that today not all leaders are

prepared to find both raw materials and consumers for their output independently for themselves. Some imbalance is inevitable at first, but even now we have only the illusion of balance. The sooner we start, the sooner we will learn to work directly for a real consumer.

There is also another, more important reason requiring enterprises to be freed most speedily from ministries. This is probably the main aim of our conference. Local soviets will never receive any real power under any electoral system unless enterprises are freed from ministries. They won't obtain it without a fundamental change in the procedure for forming local soviets' budgets. Once again I must repeat, since the report in fact mentioned this, that we also support this proposal.

I will cite just two examples. It is well known, for instance, that an enterprise has to pay for every worker. It would seem that this money should go first to the local soviets on the territory where the man lives. However, the Ministry of Finance takes this money down to the last ruble. Of course, some proportion of it comes back later. But it is not a question of arithmetic, of who gets more and who gets less—ultimately everything remains within our country. The damage lies elsewhere. This system continues to reinforce the regional organs' firm dependence. That is one aspect. On the other hand, this system creates the semblance of necessity and bolsters the importance of a central apparatus to which you have to bow and scrape for every ruble. Here is a literally fresh example of this from yesterday. Leninsk-Kuznetskiy miners had to spend months in Moscow looking for someone who would authorize them to sell above-plan (above-plan, I stress) coal abroad in exchange for supplies of equipment sets for a hospital. That is their affair. Their affair alone, and no one should interfere in it. On the contrary—there should be an organ which ought to help them find a suitable partner for this business.

Second. It would seem most logical for the local budget to be rendered directly dependent on the mass of profit made by enterprises under union jurisdiction. Such enterprises are in the overwhelming majority in the Kuzbass. They employ 925,000 workers. In 1987 these enterprises obtained profits of more than R1.7 billion, of which R1.3 million alone were assigned to the local budget. This represents R1.38 per worker. This is all very well but it does not constitute a link between the enterprise and the local soviet. You are all well aware that at the slightest provocation—when there is no water, no heating, or the hospital collapses—the ministry is certainly not to blame: It is far away and does not sense its own guilt. Whereas the local soviet will always appear guilty in the eyes of the electorate even if it is not. But it is not totally a matter of who is guilty. People suffer in any case, and the prestige of the party and the state also suffers. There is probably no need to wait: It is necessary to switch immediately as of 1989 to socially well-founded normatives in the formation of the local budget, which in conjunction with political measures to give soviets back their primary essence will create real opportunities for the development of self-management principles at local level. We are convinced that a program to really strengthen the soviets will be one of the main results of our conference.

I would like to talk about another proposal which provoked the most tumultuous discussion among our delegation during the recess. I am referring to the fact that party obkom, kraykom, raykom, or gorkom first secretaries should ultimately be put to a secret ballot at sessions and be elected chairman of the presidium of the appropriate soviets if deputies give them a vote of confidence. I think that this proposal, although at first glance it concentrates an excessively large amount of power in the hands of one man, in fact solves all problems. We have long been thinking about how to boost the role and prestige of the soviets and how to give them power. So this proposal—unite in order to delimit functions—solves everything in the requisite fashion. It must not be forgotten that this will take place in the completely new political situation of broad democratization of all our public life. Under these conditions dual control works: If deputies do not trust you, then you quit the post of first secretary, whoever you are. There is no need to be afraid of this; it is indisputably a measure which will solve many things: It is, perhaps, unexpected but it will prove its worth. (applause)

Comrades! If we really strengthen the local soviets very firmly, there are and will be still problems, as there have been, which will require all-union efforts. Expressing the common opinion of the participants in the oblast discussion of the Central Committee Theses, our delegation would like to draw the attention of the USSR Council of Ministers to the need to change departments' approaches to the use of the Kuzbass' unique natural resources. A small region where barely more than 1 percent of the country's population lives provides almost one-third of the coking coal and one-fifth of the power station coal. Not to mention metal, cement, and fertilizers. It is indisputable that the contribution of the Kuznetsk Basin above all to the country's power program should and will grow. This is inevitable for a whole series of subjective and objective reasons. But something else is also clear. Our new life and our new policy—I stress, the party policy, which has awakened people's consciousness—do not now permit any tasks, even the most pressing economic tasks, to be resolved in a consumerist fashion, rapaciously, carelessly, to the detriment of nature or people's health. This is not a new question. The 27th Party Congress tasked the Academy of Sciences, the USSR Gosplan, and the State Committee for Science with elaborating a scientific concept for Kuzbass socioeconomic development. However, the congress' commission was in effect not fulfilled. The lack of a scientifically studied general concept for the development of the basin, the violation of the ecological balance, the everworsening imbalances in the infrastructure, power generation, transport, and the construction industry, and—the main thing—the obvious trend to lag behind the

average Russian level in the socioconsumer and cultural complex greatly complicate the fulfillment of Kuzbass workers' pledges to the country. I must admit honestly that the Kuzbass does not have the requisite scientific potential. Almost all our neighbors in the Siberian oblasts have been more farsighted and have organized large-scale scientific centers already. We, of course, are ourselves guilty. But although we have been raising this question for a long time, we have found no support. At the same time life shows that "alien" science and mining are, figuratively speaking, poor bedfellows. We have no choice but to insist that economic science and the Gosplan—incidentally, we rank the Gosplan with economic science—finally do their job and tell us how to eliminate all these disproportions and what the dynamics in the rate of development of coal mining, metallurgy, and chemistry are to be in the light of the need to sharply reduce environmental pollution and given the priority of resolving the urgent tasks of eliminating the lag in the social sphere and in the agro-industrial complex without reducing the volume of production construction.

I must say that the most fundamental question (the speech also mentioned this), which is the only basis for securing a real breakthrough in rates of socioeconomic development—it is a question of reliance on science and the scientific and technical revolution (incidentally, the Central Committee Theses do not even contain the concept of the "scientific and technical revolution" but there is "scientific and technical progress"; these are probably not one and the same thing)—is still being resolved in our country at the level of appeals and slogans. The economic mechanism, as noted in the Theses, must be channeled toward it, but as yet this is not being done. The transition to self-financing of enterprises—we can all see this now—has really led to a reduction in expenditure on science. Either production workers don't need that kind of science or the economic mechanism is continuing to work against science. Perhaps it is a bit of both. Once again party organs probably need to intervene here.

Comrades! The Kuzbass Communists and workers have no doubts that the ideas of restructuring will conquer both dogmatism and sluggishness in socialist building and also the irresponsibility and maliciousness of extremism and demagoguery, if we take care of one condition that was very firmly mentioned in the speech. I am referring to the program to transform and strengthen the party's leading and organizing role. This is probably the most major question of fundamental importance for us party workers. I must say that this basic principle has been discussed in different ways with different audiences. Workers and veterans unconditionally support it and debates are unfolding among the intelligentsia and young people. By and large Kuzbass Communists are unanimous: The party and party discipline must be strengthened; it is necessary to thoroughly tackle the enhancing of the party's real prestige; the apparatus must be reappraised after sending a large proportion of this apparatus down from obkoms and gorkoms to grassroots sections and primary party organizations; and true party comradeliness, democracy, and openness must be developed. We fully support all the ideas and tenets expressed in the report in this context.

The Kemerovo delegation submits one specific proposal in this connection. It is necessary to switch to the normative formation of the party budget subject to the numerical strength of the organizations, taking into consideration all possible complicating factors (the territory, the national makeup, and production features). Having determined such normatives—this is where all Central Committee regularization must end—party obkoms themselves must be given the right to determine the structure, the staffs, the numerical strength, the salaries, and whatever they want within the funds available. What resources will the primary organization have left at its disposal? Very many people are talking about this. What is to be done with the salary of the secretary who has been relieved of this post and how is his salary to be fixed—there are different conditions and different possibilities everywhere.

I must say that, having fully realized the need to radically step up work in labor collectives, this must not be effectively braked by continuing to form the party apparatus, not on the basis of business qualities, but in accordance with the wages level. Try, for instance, in Mezhdurechenesk or Kiselevsk to select a gorkom instructor with experience of party work in a mine on a salary of R200-220 from the Kuzbass' leading sector—the coal sector—where a mining expert or section chief receives from R500 to R800. Great freedom is necessary on these questions within the quota set for the party obkom.

I think that freedom is also necessary on other statute questions. For instance, in our opinion, we must give up regularizing times for holding party meetings and plenums. This question should not be stipulated at all: This matter may probably be entrusted to the party organization.

Supporting the proposal that one should not serve more than two terms in succession in elective posts (apart from primary party organizations), we believe here that a procedural mechanism allowing interim elections to take place without waiting for the term to expire could be elaborated to supplement this. This would be more democratic.

Finally, one more generally minor but quite acute question which everyone present has evidently heard about on several occasions. I am referring to the "fantastic privileges" which party workers supposedly possess. I must be frank and admit that it is very difficult to overcome this opinion, which has not taken root in everyday consciousness unaided. The Central Committee must adopt a decision on this question: It must determine what is offered to whom, ranging from a Politburo member to a raykom instructor. Although this

is purely a matter for us within the party, the decision must be made public. It is possible that soviet, trade union, and other organs will also follow the party's example, and one can be confident that the rumors that have been spread about fabricated social injustice will stop. But I want to cite several figures by way of an example. Based on effective work-time, the average hourly wages for a fifth-category mining worker in the Kuzbass, a third-category seamstress, and a party worker are R3.42, R1.15, and 88 kopeks respectively. The party's prestige was never gauged before and will not evidently be gauged in future by the level of a party worker's wages, because most CPSU members—unselfish and honest workers and zealots, who voluntarily, deliberately, and sincerely strive to serve people—bear a heavy burden of responsibility for the implementation of the main slogan of restructuring—"More socialism!"

The speech correctly said that we will not achieve this if we do not strengthen the CPSU on the basis of Leninist principles, if we neglect its leadership role, impair party discipline, and indulge the attempts of certain independent groups to put the party under their control. This will not happen if we encourage attempts to take away party committees' chance of having their party press. It is incomprehensible how a party committee which is to implement the role of political fighter can do without its party press and its party mass media. I am not calling for control, admittedly, over LITERATURNAYA GAZETA or ARGUMENTY I FAKTY; I am talking about the party press. The party press is necessary. It is the main instrument on which we can rely in our struggle for the ideas of restructuring. (applause)

I think that all sorts of splendid phrases, however superficially effective and advantageous they may be, on the "party of restructuring" and all kinds of very revolutionary appeals to "take power" (moreover, it is incomprehensible who is to take power and from whom) are nothing but either thoughtless irresponsibility and self-esteem or a far from inoffensive, well conceived, and organized campaign which ultimately has nothing in common with the party line of restructuring. (applause) There is nowhere for the party to work apart from among the masses. (applause) But there, too, it must be a Leninist-type political party. In short, by increasingly returning in practice to Lenin's understanding of the essence of socialism, we must also equally return in practice to Lenin's understanding of the role of the party, which must remain the political leader of all the working masses by transforming, developing, and restructuring itself. (applause)

Motornyy Conference Speech

PM3006142388 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jun 88 Second Edition p 2

[Speech by D.K. Motornyy, chairman of the Kirov Kolkhoz, Kherson Oblast, at 28 June afternoon session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference]

[Text] All we conference delegates listened attentively to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report, which provided a profound analysis, on the basis of Marxist-Leninist dialectics, of the progress in implementing the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and set tasks for intensifying the restructuring process. Realistically assessing what has been done, we are logically coming to the main conclusion—there is no alternative to restructuring. It has embraced all strata and spheres of society, is gathering strength, and has spread far and wide. The CPSU's course for restructuring, for accelerating the country's socioeconomic development, is unanimously supported by our people. This was convincingly confirmed during the discussion of the CPSU Central Committee Theses for the 19th All-Union Party Conference.

It is a long time since there has been such sincere and universal interest as now during the debates on the CPSU Central Committee Theses, which are rightly called the manifesto of restructuring. More than 11,000 constructive proposals and remarks were made during the discussion in our oblast alone. And they are all permeated with concern for restructuring's fate and for giving a new impetus to the acceleration of socioeconomic development. The workers of our kolkhoz fully approve and support the course the party has adopted toward the intensified development of the potential of the kolkhozes and sovkhozes. It was precisely thanks to improving the organization of labor remuneration and to introducing economic accountability [khozraschet], the collective and individual contract, and self-management that we managed to ensure the dynamic development of all sectors in the economy.

Today judging whether you are in favor of restructuring or not can only be done by practical deeds. This is one of the main indicators, and in this respect, if we are going to compare the indicators over 2 years with the average indicators for the 11th 5-year plan, then without wishing to boast, we can say that we increased the grain yield by 9 quintals, bringing it up to 54 quintals [per hectare]; we increased the milk yield by 278 kg per cow, and we have 1,600 Red Steppe cows, which are less productive than certain others. And this year we shall fulfill that task which was set for the end of the 12th 5-Year Plan: For the whole herd we will obtain 5,000 kg of milk per cow. The average delivery weight of each head of cattle is more than 600 kg for the kolkhoz as a whole. We will get more than R5 million net income and the profitability level will be approximately about 80 percent.

I, comrades, have named all the successes except one which, I think, is decisive for our arid steppe—irrigation. Irrigation for us steppe people is life. It accelerates our development, it guarantees the decisions of the Food Program, it is the guarantee for successfully resolving social questions. He who calls for reducing capital investments for developing irrigation does not simply want to hinder our progress, he wants to push us into the swamp of poverty from which, comrades, it will be so difficult to get out. Specialist scientists must do everything necessary for the triumph of common sense: Irrigation must be developed as far as possible for the good of our people.

Comrades, are there reserves for the additional growth of production on our kolkhoz? Yes, there are, and we can see them. Above all in introducing scientific and technical progress, in establishing business ties with other enterprises on the basis of developing the cooperatives and subsidiary business activities, and in developing initiative and enterprise in every economically accountable collective, every kolkhoz, and every kolkhoz member. In other words, we must judiciously unite the interests of the kolkhoz with the personal interests of the kolkhoz member.

Comrades, we sometimes complain that we have few good-quality goods and at the same time individual workers, kolkhoz members, and scientists do not want to work well. We have grown used to low remuneration and poor work. Today a different trend is emerging in some places—good work but fabulously high remuneration, 3-4 times higher than the quantity and quality of the labor invested. Both the former and the latter are bad. We do not know how to use objective economic laws, especially the law of distribution according to labor. And the economic scientists have a tremendous share of the blame here. So far economic science provides recommendations by the trial and error method. Today economists and finance workers are determining for themselves the main salient in their work—devising norms for deduction from profit, for the wages fund, the numerical strength of workers, and so forth. Here they are devising norms in the following way: the higher the profit, the higher the deductions, which, of course, does not promote labor productivity growth or productivity. Economic levers thus in practice become delaying levers. The kolkohzes, for instance, can, I am convinced, only wrest from the apparatchiks the right to command which the latter have usurped on condition that the economy is democratized. It should become a law that only he who earns money can dispose of it. In brief, without scientifically substantiated norms for deducting money for the budget and centralized funds we will not ensure the normal functioning of the economic mechanism under the new conditions. The distortions which have been allowed must be put right immediately.

We realize that we will be able to implement a radical economic reform only when fundamental questions such as the reform of prices and price formation and wholesale trade in the basic means of production and goods under conditions where they are in short supply have been elaborated.

In examining these questions an exceptionally balanced approach is needed. We cannot allow mistakes in this case. You all well know what a burden is imposed on the prime cost of agricultural output by immoderately high prices for tractors, trucks, agricultural machinery, fertilizers, and construction materials. That is why it seems to us that new wholesale prices for industrial output, transport and communications tariffs and services and also estimates in construction should be put into operation at the same time that new purchase prices are introduced for agricultural output. [sentence as published] Here, comrades, yet another seemingly concealed and not entirely pleasant phenomenon can be discerned. If we continue to extort money from kolkhozes and sovkhozes they will be reluctant to use credits. They will try not to order equipment; they will calculate how advantageous it is to buy fertilizers which could be considerably more expensive than the additional sum obtained from their use. In brief, we are involuntarily disrupting the rhythm of industrial enterprises, which will remain without orders and will stop producing individual types of agricultural equipment. And when a shortage of this machinery appears in 2-3 years, we will be unable to eliminate this shortage for several years and will suffer enormous losses as a result. Approximately the same thing will happen that happened to us with washing machines.

Comrades, these relationships in price formation are also important because the kolkhozes and sovkhozes are switching to full economic accountability [khozraschet], self financing, and cost recovery [samookupayemost]. Now it is no longer by methods involving administrative pressure but through economic levers that we must encourage the buildup of the production of all types of agricultural output and the improvement of its quality.

There's no denying that the people assess the results of restructuring primarily by the tangibility of the advances in supplying food and satisfying man's other living requirements. This was convincingly stated in the report by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. Unfortunately, the situation is improving only very slowly. There are many reasons for this. The main ones lie in disregard for economic incentives, new forms of organizing labor, and the urgent need for the social restructuring of the countryside. We must back up a strong social policy with radical, prompt measures to create a modern social infrastructure for the countryside.

Today we have a migration of the rural population. And it is not because people do not earn much but only because in some villages the necessary consumer conditions for life do not exist. For the countryside today or rather for the countryside yesterday, we had to resolve three most important questions: providing heat, constructing roads, and providing water pipelines and sewage. That is the main thing. And then, even if there is no housing, people will come, take credits, and construct for themselves. But today, inasmuch as these three main conditions are lacking, people simply leave for the cities. Unless we eliminate these substantial differences between the city and the countryside over the next two 5-year plans, we will be in a very difficult position. And we will continue to criticize each other, we will be ashamed, but we will never resolve these problems without the people who are leaving today. (applause).

Dear comrades! I should like the question of pensions for kolkhoz members to be really resolved in the very near future. The question of organizing construction in the countryside using people's own resources also demands a

solution. Today we have been given scope for action. Well, what next? Kolkhozes are not given a single kilogram of nails, a single kilogram of cement, a single cubic meter of timber for this construction. How can we understand all this? Why have we created construction subdivisions on the kolkhozes?! (applause).

Comrades, we are very grateful to the party Central Committee for the fact that a forum of kolkhoz members—the fourth all-union congress—has been held and great decisions were made. People have now taken heart and, feeling the concern shown for them, have started to work better.

Today, since the congress, the model kolkhoz charter has already been completely edited and all positions have been defined. We kolkhoz members would like the charter to have the force of law. We ask the Supreme Soviet Presidium to make it a legal document.

Comrades, each of us delegates to such an eminent forum must be exceptionally responsible in his approach to preparing and adopting the comprehensively considered decisions of the 19th all-union party conference, whose implementation will accelerate resolute headway and make revolutionary restructuring irreversible.

Having begun the revolution, we must go to the end, Vladimir Ilich Lenin said. So it is today—we must see revolutionary restructuring through to the end, clearing all obstacles on the path toward a new appearance for socialism. For this we must serry our ranks even more closely on the platform of restructuring, strengthen the alliance of the working class, peasantry, and intelligentsia, and by our daily labor and public activity consolidate the prestige of the party of Lenin—the guarantor of restructuring. (applause).

Kolbin Views Restructuring

PM3006095088 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jun 88 Second Edition pp 2, 3

[Speech delivered by G.V. Kolbin, first secretary of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee, at 28 June afternoon session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference]

[Text] Comrades! The preparations for this conference took place in extraordinary conditions. The turbulent process of development of democracy and the revolutionary spirit of the CPSU Central Committee theses aroused society's forces. Under their pressure, the barrier of taciturn indifference and patient silence among the people was broken. Everyone broke into unfettered speech at once—workers and writers, peasants and students, party and economic workers. They started talking about urgent matters, matters affecting the vital interests of each individual and society as a whole. In the period of preparations for the conference, glasnost clearly displayed substantial positive features. It became constructive, oriented toward recitifying the concrete deformation of social development. That is particularly gratifying for us, because the situation that arose in Kazakhstan 18 months ago gave rise to serious fears. In that period a real threat was created to the transformations mapped out by restructuring. The CPSU Central Committee resolution on the international and patriotic education of working people by the Kazakh republican party organization was of decisive significance in eliminating negative phenomenon and normalizing the situation that had arisen.

What runs right through this political document is the profound Leninist idea that national self-consciousness never develops of its own accord. Its development is determined by socioeconomic conditions and the moral and psychological climate in society. The success of international education depends on the overall resolution of these and a whole series of other very concrete questions, including propaganda and agitation in the development of people's spiritual world.

On the basis of the provisions and conclusions of the CPSU Central Committee resolution, over the past year the republic's Communists managed to find unconventional approaches to resolving the acute social problems. An example is the major breakthrough in providing people with apartments. The pace achieved last year is now increasing still further. By the 19th party conference, in Kazakhstan as a whole, 57 percent of the housing planned for the year had been commissioned, and the volume of construction was 20 percent greater than the same period last year. Moreover, the practice which is becoming established in the republic of selling apartments to the population for cash both in the cities and in the countryside is quite a good way of helping to solve the housing problem. In the current half-year alone some 2,000 such apartments have been sold.

Nor are we slackening our attention toward social, cultural, and consumer facilities. In the 1st half-year all the planned clubs, hospitals, clinics, and schools were commissioned.

Kazakhstan's working people have observed some improvement in food supplies. We have all the prerequisites for increasing per capita consumption of meat by 10 kg and bringing that indicator to 68 kg a year on the results of the first 3 years of the 5-year plan. These examples show convincingly that there are considerable reserves in the republic for the more successful resolution of other, as yet unsolved problems.

Thus, despite the general trend toward an improvement in food supplies, in various oblasts of the republic this process is still uneven, as Mikhail Sergeyevich said in his report. Our agrarian oblasts have surged forward. The industrial oblasts are still lagging behind, for quite

understandable reasons. We are persistently seeking approaches to the elimination of these distortions, but we have not yet achieved the desired parity.

Kazakhstan is also rightly criticized because we still import canned fruit and vegetables from other republics. There is a shortage of groat products and the processing industry is lagging behind in its development. We have a lot of work to do to provide the necessary quantity of hay stores, sheepfolds for overwintering the sheep, and feed preparation units. The expansion of the network of slaughterhouses and cold stores will not tolerate delay.

The main reason for the slow resolution of all these problems is the lack of construction capacities. We are aware that with the passage of time the difficulties will increase still further. The dynamic of the pace of construction and installation work in the republic is constantly growing, and in 1989 preliminary predictions promise a 20-percent increase.

Thus, in the second half of the 5-year plan we will not be able to heave a sigh of relief, but a start has been made. Will the work proceed of its own accord now? No, it will not. On the contrary, a still greater organizational and political pace, still greater unity of word and deed, will be needed.

We have apparently shown concern for the unity of word and deed even before now. There is no point in denying that not infrequently we have been concerned and adapted the one to the other artificially. We took what was already achieved as the starting point. That was the base on which we built our future plans, failing entirely to make them conform to people's real needs. As a result, paramount importance was attached not to the final outcome, not to the radical solution of the problem, but to juggling with fine-looking figures.

Unfortunately, such flawed approaches have still not been eradicated in our republic today. But people are tired of figures, of unfounded assertions about the steady growth of their prosperity. They now need tangible changes, which, without superfluous explanations, would themselves convince people of the attainment of the goals set.

In this context I would like to say: The renunciation of the practice whereby party committees duplicate the functions of soviet and economic organs has been received with profound understanding by the republic's Communists. At the same time, we are aware that this change in the style and methods of party activity will certainly not alleviate our lot, first and foremost because by no means have all party workers acquired the skill of acting in the new, not entirely accustomed atmosphere of widening democratization and glasnost.

This skill is particularly important in the practice of the management of national relations and relations between nationalities. After the well-known Alma-Ata events of December 1986, the republican party organization began to concern itself considerably more actively and practically with predicting problems that may arise.

Today the Communist Party Central Committee Sector for Relations Between Nationalities coordinates the activity of all republican organs, each of which has its clearly delineated duties in accordance with existing procedures and legislation. There are no faceless issues. They are all assigned to someone. The question of the organizational and political activity of the republic's party organizations in fulfilling the requirements of the CPSU Central Committee Resolution on International and Patriotic Education was examined recently at a Kazakhstan Communist Party Central Committee Plenum. The bureau report and all the speeches were published in the press, with no abridgments, at a time when the nationwide discussion of the CPSU Central Committee Theses was in full swing. And that struck a special political chord. We have satisfaction in reporting to the conference that the course set by Kazakhstan's Communists in resolving national problems and the problems of relations between nationalities and the assessments and conclusions of the Communist Party Central Committee plenum met with unanimous support and approval in all strata of society without exception: among workers, kolkhoz members, the intelligentsia, and students. Of course, that places great obligations upon us. We will still have to work staunchly on the fulfillment of the Central Committee resolution for many a year, since stagnation phenomena in the economy and the ideological and political sphere had put down deeper roots in the republic than in other regions of the country. People are still tolerating them, but only for the time being. And those whose job it is to see to the resolution of urgent questions are already having to answer for their mistakes and omissions. In this atmosphere of enhanced exactingness and intolerance of shortcomings, party organs must be particularly responsible in their approach to the selection and education of cadres.

Vladimir Ilich Lenin wrote: "You have to have a head on your shoulders to know how to get to the bottom of each individual case." And indeed, positive changes are taking place where, for instance, the oblast party organization is headed by an intelligent person. These people do not rule everything themselves, but know how to see what is most important, draw others' attention to it, and conduct matters so that everyone is working toward the same goal. Talented party leaders are known to the whole country today. There are plenty of them in Kazakhstan. The main task of party organs is precisely to choose a good head for every sector of party, soviet, or economic work.

Another important aspect of party political work is a skillful, differentiated approach to different categories of working people. In the conditions of the development of democracy people's activeness is growing and so-called informal leaders are emerging. They often make the right

demands and raise really important, urgent questions, on the basis of which they gather around them those who support a rapid pace of restructuring. But very often in the actions of these leaders we come across instances of excesses, maximalism, and lack of contact with reality in the measures they propose for resolving particular problems, and sometimes even open attacks on party and soviet organs. People of this category require the keen attention of leaders at various levels and of all Communists. Our task is to support in every way their noble desire to speed up the changes, but to channel it in the right direction. There are also others whom I would call pseudoleaders, among whom there are some who have a party card in their pocket. They deliberately mislead the public with ideas they know to be far-fetched, and seek to substitute frenzied anarchy for democracy. Nothing but indignation can be aroused, for instance, by irresponsible calls for the immediate closure of all enterprises whose activity has some kind of effect on the ecological situation. How can you call that a realistic, constructive approach? And what do they really have to offer people, these organizers of all kinds of rallies and demonstrations who often confine themselves merely to empty talk?

All these defenders of rights and freedoms, in their insatiable ambition, somehow forget about another important aspect of democracy: the duty of citizens to society. In their declarations they somehow omit to draw people's attention to the need to strengthen labor and production discipline, on the contrary, they connive with those who organize strikes and disrupt the plans for our acceleration. No, these people do not help restructuring; on the contrary, they hamper it and delay it. (applause)

We do not need phrasemongering, even of the ultrarevolutionary variety. What we need is to conduct painstaking explanatory work, make every effort to ensure loyalty to Marxist-Leninist approaches, and establish a high standard of debate and mutual respect; that is, to seek precisely the kind of democracy that Vladimir Ilich Lenin had in mind, not those popularity-hungry individuals who, frankly, abuse the patience of the majority of people.

Comrades! In the conditions of a multinational republic special significance is attached to work with the creative intelligentsia. It is they who are the repository of the ideas of national self-awareness. It is they who actively influence its formation.

We must also take into account the fact that debates and disputes arise particularly frequently in this milieu and not infrequently members of the intelligentsia put forward trenchant formulas which wound the self-esteem of certain workers who, instead of looking into the matter, seek to suppress any difference of opinion.

We should not be afraid of debates, because they are the starting point for any creativity. Ultimately, if the desire to change something, to restructure, is to arise in people, disagreement with the existing state of affairs is necessary. Dissatisfaction with our achievements is the motive force that leads to revolutionary transformations. Therefore, we should show understanding and solicitude toward those brilliant, talented individuals who express the people's aspirations and make allowances, without fail, for their characteristically heightened sense of social justice and temperament. These people must be valued highly and cherished, rather than calling into question their devotion to our common cause. In a word, we must unite, we must rally all the available forces for the sake of resolving the difficult tasks that we are setting ourselves at the present conference.

We must, in my view, take care to safeguard the party's prestige against the attacks of all kinds which have begun to appear from time to time, appositely or otherwise. (applause)

We must also concern ourselves with further increasing the party's prestige, which can only be achieved through the concrete action and efforts of every Communist and every party organ. And here we should do everything to establish a sense of party comradeship. Many of us lack that sense of comradeship. Now that restructuring demands drastic changes in everyone's actions, we urgently need comradely cohesion.

Let us recall Lenin's idea that a decision adopted by the entire party is equivalent to our word of honor, given to ourselves in good will. Remaining true to this behest of Lenin's, we must now join together and establish a pure moral atmosphere, an atmosphere of good will, within the party.

I would like to say, comrades, that the proposals we put forward at the meetings preceding the present conference to the party Central Committee leadership, the Politburo members, and Mikhail Sergeyevich were all reflected in the report delivered by Mikhail Sergeyevich. There is no need to repeat them. I would only like to add that the Communists and all working people of the country greet with satisfaction the constructive new approaches that form the basis of our foreign policy. The people notice everything, both positive and negative aspects of our work, and evaluate it accurately and without bias. And people quite rightly associate the large-scale phenomenon that for such a long time no one had managed to achieve in international life, the renunciation of the arms race, with the enterprising activity of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. (applause)

Real steps in this direction are making mankind's age-old dream of peace a reality and guarantee an improvement in the living standard of millions of working people, not only in our country.

Comrades, the course set by the party in both foreign and domestic policy is expounded graphically and convincingly in the report at the party conference today. It finds

a response and support in the heart of every Communist and every Soviet person, because it is a truly Leninist course. Following this course, we will certainly win. (applause)

Moscow Gorkom Chief Belyaninov

PM3006150188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jun 88 Second Edition p 3

[Speech by V.K. Belyaninov, secretary of Moscow CPSU Gorkom, at 28 June afternoon session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference]

[Text] Comrades, the tremendous responsibility for the fate of our great country, for the fate of restructuring has turned us, the delegates of the 19th all-union party conference, into people with the same purpose, into comrades-in-arms. Each one of us bears great responsibility for the implementation of the key behest of the party and the people—to confidently steer the course of the April plenum and to translate the collective thought into real actions. I am convinced that the conference will confirm with new force what Soviet people are expecting from it; namely, that restructuring will stand its ground, that restructuring will win the day! The propositions expressed in M.S. Gorbachev's report enrich and concretize our notions about socialism's potential. They accord with the thoughts and mood of most of the capital's Communists and nonparty people. During the discussion of the CPSU Central Committee Theses in the city's party organizations and labor collectives, more than 130,000 proposals and addenda were submitted which became the Moscow delegation's mandate. We support the party's course toward the further development and deepening of restructuring, the implementation of the economic reform along the whole front, and a bold reconstruction of the political system. However, Muscovites resolutely rebut those who, juggling with democratization slogans, would like to divert people from creative labor and direct them toward fruitless demagoguery and even the kindling of nationalism, anarchy, and political confrontation. Today, in the conditions of the socialist pluralism of opinions, and the emergence of a nationwide movement for the renewal of society, the party must play the vanguard role in restructuring.

More than ever before, the party needs firm links with the masses and the ability to flexibly change its tactics in accordance with new situations. This Leninist demand is well known. However, for many years it was basically no more than hollow words. The more quickly we cure ourselves of the dogmatisms which eroded and sometimes even atrophied the party organism, and the more deeply we learn to get to the essence of Lenin's legacy, the higher the party's prestige will be and the more fully will our society absorb the vital juices of restructuring.

The people rightly regard glasnost and veracity as the reliable motive force of renewal. All of us, each party organization, will have to persistently learn to act according to the laws of the political vanguard. This, as the capital's experience has shown, is not easy. Even in the 4th year of restructuring we have not entirely succeeded in eliminating administration by injunction, the gross output approach, and secrecy in the work of party organizations. In Moscow, the whole multifaceted and contradictory nature of our life is reflected as in a microcosm. It was here that the impulses for change originated. Here, from its first days, restructuring had the firm support of the capital's working class. Here the party initiatives merged with the awakened creative thought of scientists, artists, and writers on current affairs. However, side by side with these there survived bureaucracy, ostentation, an arrogant indifference to people's rights and needs, and the bureaucratic commands of leaders at various levels.

The city party organization is working hard to eliminate the shortcomings noted at the 27th CPSU Congress, to overcome the complacency which took root in Moscow in the past, the overemphasis on successes, and attempts to skirt complex problems. To be frank, breaking out of the stagnation is proving no simple matter in many spheres of the city's life. As we know, during the first stage of restructuring in Moscow there were attempts to eliminate sluggishness and indecision [oblomovshchina] at a stroke with the help of revolutionary babble and hasty cadre reshuffles. The Central Committee and the city's Communists denounced this kind of approach which does not accord with the essence of restructuring since it is impossible to implement policy without the broad participation of the masses, merely by recourse to slogans and directives.

Now a sound, comradely, businesslike atmosphere is increasingly developing in the city's party organizations. The political maturity of the capital's Communists and the purposeful work of labor collectives have made it possible to ensure stable progress along the road of the economy's intensification. The target for labor productivity growth for the first 3 years of the 5-year plan has been met, contract discipline is being established, deliveries have been 99.9 percent fulfilled. There is closer coordination between sector and territorial interests, between the tasks of the acceleration of scientific and technical progress and the progressive development of the social sphere.

However, a radical breakthrough has still not been achieved. The progress of restructuring in the national economy shows that additional measures of an economic, organizational, and political nature are needed to make the acceleration of scientific and technical progress tangible.

Through the assimilation of the new management methods, party leadership is being concentrated directly in the labor collectives. It is here that the implementation of the economic reform and the enforcement of the Law on the State Enterprise is still being held up by the poor level of development of intraproduction economic

accountability [vnutriproizvodstvennyy khozraschet] and a tendency to go for short-term advantages. Efforts to pass the buck rather than exercise independence, and to force the working people's activeness into the old framework of pointless meetings and excessive paperwork have still not been overcome. The fear of exercising power persists.

This is precisely what is hampering the full development of economic accountability and holding up the establishment of cooperatives and the lease contract. All this has ultimately meant that the current rate of implementation of social tasks quite rightly fails to satisfy Muscovites and entails disruptions in food supplies and in the provision of transport and medical services.

Therefore, we can only support the task, raised in the report, of basically completing the adjustment of the new economic mechanism in the current 5-year plan.

The residual approach applied over the decades to the development of the social sphere has resulted in the considerable neglect of this sphere. The solution of simple questions gets bogged down in endless coordination with dozens of departments, especially when it comes to providing the population with food products.

In Moscow the supply of potatoes, vegetables, and fruit has long been unsatisfactory. In order to track down those to blame for the disgraceful situation in the city's provision with potatoes and vegetables it was necessary a few days ago to gather representatives of almost a score of ministries and departments at the party gorkom. And, just as in previous years, we encountered uncoordinated actions, fragmentation of responsibility, and the absense of an integrated system which would embrace the whole process of the production, storage, delivery, and sale of output. This is again and again adversely affecting the interests of the 16 million people living in Moscow City and Oblast.

For similar reasons Moscow theaters, museums, and libraries are in a sorry state and the material base of the capital's cultural sphere is in a state of neglect. Here, too, the blame lies not only with Moscow City Soviet but with the various departments; here, too, we have a lack of coordination between a multitude of agencies; here, too, we have the notorious residual approach. The report drew the entirely justified conclusion that work on restructuring and the cutback of the management apparatus cannot be reduced to a one-off campaign or mechanical reorganizations. It must be a continuous process and, in line with the management system, back up the changes taking place in society. (applause)

Moscow, as you know, comrades, has abandoned the quota system in the hire of labor. This does not mean, of course, that we do not need extra hands; we have a manpower shortage because the retooling of such major enterprises as the Likhachev Automobile Plant is progressing too slowly. The staff of ministries, departments, and other administrative organs is being reduced by 40 percent, that is, by more than 70,000 people. However, only a few people have switched to the production and services spheres.

We are taking account of all the aforementioned processes and problems in the elaboration of a new general plan for the development of the Moscow region and a program for the intensification of the capital's national economy—"Progress-95." A new general scheme of national economic management in Moscow has been elaborated which envisages delineation of the functions of soviet and economic organs, the greater independence of the rayon component, and enhanced responsibility of rayispolkoms for the comprehensive development of territories under their jurisdiction. However, in order to ensure that the local soviets wield real power, their financial potential must be strengthened, especially during the switch to economic accountability, and we must ensure both the formation of local budget revenues on the basis of long-term normatives with a differential approach to each rayon, and a considerable enlargement of the monetary receipts from enterprises located on a given territory; there must also be a more precise definition of the relations between soviets and labor collectives.

The combination of territorial and sectoral interests in the work of soviets calls for a different approach to the formation of local organs of power so as to ensure that delegates representing the labor collectives and the population and public organizations are elected to rayon soviets in major cities.

The separation of the functions of party, soviet, and economic organs and the new management schemes also demand the reorganization of the party apparatus. Its structure must be determined by the current tasks of the party and, of course, as Comrade Bakatin rightly noted, local characteristics. How could a standard model of a party raykom be viable in Moscow if you have 50,000 Communists in 1 rayon, while in another you have 20,000; if 1 rayon has a population of 90,000, while another has 650,000? In the opinion of the capital's Communists, the conference must express itself in favor of granting local party organs the right to independently determine the structure of the apparatus, its numerical strength, and the wages of its personnel.

The radical reconstruction of the political system will have a tremendous effect on the acceleration of the processes of renewal in the country. The whole range of specific measures described in the report and pertaining to the fundamental clarification of the powers of the party and the soviets in current conditions, the enhancement of the role of elective organs in respect to executive organs, the further democratization of electoral practice, and the strengthening of the socialist legal state deserves approval. Of particular importance will be the return to

the Leninist traditions of holding congresses of soviets with direct representation of public organizations, and the restoration of a unified system of people's control.

As has been rightly noted, the prestige of the organs of soviet power will be enhanced if they are headed by democratically elected party leaders.

Moscow is the living heart of our homeland. Its pulse is felt throughout the country. The functions of the capital are multifaceted and responsible. Cultural and scientific centers, sector headquarters, and state and public organizations are concentrated here. This places a special responsibility on the city's party organizations since the social and economic development of the country's regions depends largely on the effectiveness of the work of republic and union organs. (applause)

The successes and problems of any of the fraternal republics produce different echoes in the capital. In Moscow, the capital of a multinational state, union, and autonomous republic culture-and-information and culture-and-trade centers have already been set up, business and friendship contacts between the city's rayons and various republic cities and rayons are being strengthened, and opportunities to satisfy our multinational city's cultural needs, including language needs, are being expanded.

People from all over the country come to Moscow to settle social and personal questions, or even just to take a look, to acquaint themselves with the capital. However, Muscovites are not always able to ensure the necessary conditions for them, and therefore Moscow is hoping for the understanding and assistance of the whole country.

A detailed analysis of the state of science was made in the report. However, at this crucial stage in the life of society I would like to emphasize the specific role of our philosophical science which is evidently unable to keep pace with restructuring. Many social scientists appear paralyzed in the face of the heap of acute problems engendered by the past and the present. Most of the articles in academic journals and even in the periodical press can be described as theoretical in name only. Propaganda workers, party officials, and all Communists badly need weighty arguments in the polemics with the antirestructuring forces of various hues. The united nationwide effort for the renewal of society calls for the full restoration of the ideals of socialism and of the values of the Soviet way of life, and for equipping the party with reliable forecasts and precise guidelines. In our opinion it is necessary to coordinate, under party leadership, the efforts of specialists in the sphere of philosophy, political economy, and party history. Central Committee departments and the Academy of Sciences should give some thought to the organizational forms of such coordination.

Comrades, the businesslike nature of the debate that preceded the conference and the committed constructive discussion of the acute problems which have accumulated, and of ways to resolve them—all this points to the timeliness of the conference's convening and its unfading theoretical and practical significance. The advisability of convening this kind of conferences is indisputable. The conference will provide our party with precise and accurately verified guidelines. The only thing it will not provide us Communists with is the right to work half-heartedly, at less than our full capacity, to present wishful thinking as reality, to stop midway. Only by deeds, by hard work, will we justify the Soviet people's trust. (applause)

Further on 29 Jun Conference Speeches

Altay Kraykom's Popov Speaks

PM3006153788 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jun 88 Second Edition p 6

[Speech by F.V. Popov, first secretary of Altay CPSU Kraykom, at the morning session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses on 29 June]

[Text] Comrade delegates! We have all remarked on the unusual nature of our party forum. One of the most important Leninist norms of party life has been revived after a prolonged gap. In accordance with the CPSU Statutes, the delegates have assembled today to check out and discuss urgent problems, critically evaluate what has been done, and outline the prospects.

The conference is discussing with interest Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report, whose importance simply cannot be overestimated, and a frank debate and tense struggle of ideas is in progress on the ways to further develop the party and Soviet society. This is evidence of the revival of true democracy and glasnost and the working people's sociopolitical activeness.

The consultation with the people began in April 1985, and has become a truly large-scale historical phenomenon. The time since April has been packed full: The concept of restructuring and its political platform were elaborated and the struggle to translate them into practical action was launched on a broad front. The ideas of restructuring have now become the core of all our work and our domestic and foreign policy.

The sociopolitical activeness of the people received a powerful new boost from the discussion of the CPSU Central Committee Theses for the 19th All-Union Party Conference. Hundreds of thousands of Communists and nonparty people in the Altay were directly involved in their discussion, and more than 10,000 proposals and criticisms were submitted. They express support for the party's strategy at this most crucial moment, raise pressing problems, and offer an exacting assessment of what has been accomplished.

The new era of socioeconomic transformation develops the initiative and creativity of people who are prepared to assume responsibility and strengthen restructuring with practical deeds. Such people are the reliable guarantee of its irreversibility. Ivan Aksentyevich Pasechnik, a grain grower well known in the kray and a delegate to today's conference, together with his sons—he has five—grew and harvested nearly 3,500 tonnes of grain on a leased field last year. That is about 600 tonnes each, while the average for the farm is 200 tonnes. Well, if you are talking about grain as a measure of a society's level of development, you would need a tonne per person, so the 6 of them have done this for 3,500 members of society. If you are talking about the consumption norm per head of population, which is in the neighborhood of 110 kg, though in the Altay people eat 140 kg, they are feeding 32,000 people. The prime cost of wheat in this unit is 3 rubles 68 kopeks. On the farm as a whole it nearly equals R7. This movement is gathering speed. Contract collectives cultivate 6.7 million hectares of arable land, out of just over 7 million in the kray. But that is not all, that is only the quantitative side.

In this movement, there is no longer any room for seasonal workers on the land. Some 4 million hectares of arable land have been assigned to grain growers, though as yet only until the end of the 5-year plan, while more than 2 million have been handed over on a lease contract basis. This land is cultivated by 952 units. In all, there are 11,000 contract teams and units in operation in the kray's agricultural production. One-third of them are led by Communists. There may be a great many figures in my speech, but I have done that on purpose, so as to provide more practical instances and show more clearly that something is indeed being done, so that, as Mikhail Sergeyevich has said, we do not talk restructuring to death, but support what we already have.

The new economic relations are destroying the customary management structure and providing impetus for the introduction of the optimum forms, especially at rayon level. The setting up of the "Slavgorodskoye" agro-industrial association was the result of collective efforts. Conference delegate Comrade Bekker, chairman of the Karl Marx Kolkhoz, has become its head.

On the instructions of the council of representatives, the rayon's entire agro-industrial complex, including processing sectors, is led by the board. The board itself hires and determines the number of specialists necessary for the task. They have already accomplished things. They have cut the management apparatus by nearly half. Deductions from profit for maintenance were formerly 5 percent; the figure now is 1 percent.

The Rubtsovskiy agro-industrial combine and an agro-industrial combine in Gorno-Altay Autonomous Oblast have begun to operate. They are the pioneers on the path of the cooperative system and the formation of fundamentally new, socialist production relations. And here the command-and-administer method of management is out of the question. The new management system can be established only through a bold, resolute reduction of the apparatus and a simplification of the structure of the kray agro-industrial committee, which in many respects duplicates the Russian and all-union agro-industrial committees. There is Comrade Bekker. He and I conferred before the conference, and he says that in the future, the kray agro-industrial committee, too, will deduct 1 percent for maintenance of the apparatus. Perhaps we could follow this road on a nationwide scale and determine how many administrators we need. That is all the more necessary because the high indicators of the leading contract collectives are eroded in the numerous levels of management and services. Thus, the leading contract collectives produce 600 tonnes of grain per person, R100,000 of output per person, while for the farm as a whole the output is no more than R25,000. And in the kray agro-industrial system as a whole, for us in Altay Kray, it totals only R10,000 per agricultural worker. We have yet to learn to cherish the peasant's labor! Here you have the gulf between the producer and the consumer—and it is too great. I think you should build a pyramid from the bottom, but we are doing so from the top. And I think we can make a change here. To define the producers and determine how many assistants we need for them is one of the major tasks on which we should focus our attention today.

The process of reviving the sense of ownership of the land should be more actively developed. At the same time, questions involving living conditions in the countryside should be tackled more purposefully. This is of enormous social significance and demands every possible support and improvement.

The fulfillment of the Food Program is a most important task for the kray party organization. We account for a noticeable percentage of Russia's grain, meat, and milk production. The kray's agrarian sector has increased the gross output of agricultural produce by 16 percent in the last 2 years. Grain purchases have increased by 70 percent, meat purchases by 20 percent, and milk purchases by 16 percent. That has made it possible to fulfill state orders and improve the supply of food to the kray's population.

There have been positive developments in the social sphere. At the same time, housing construction has grown by 15 percent, and the building of schools increased by 50 percent. The building of club institutions has more than doubled.

Pledges in honor of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference were fulfilled. Deliveries of meat, milk, and eggs were ensured ahead of schedule. For the first time, contracting organizations met the half-year plan for commissioning housing. Over the 2 years, the volume of industrial production increased 10.5 percent. The entire growth in output took place on the basis of increased labor productivity.

However, it is not easy to bring our industry's reserves fully into play and overcome the conservatism of the past and the shortcomings it caused. In general, the kray's economy has reached a very complex and crucial stage. Alongside the new elements, elements of the old economic management system persist. Only 50 percent of industry is working under the terms of the Law on State Enterprises. We have failed to establish delivery discipline, which is hampered by a lack of coordination between associates, the slow introduction of resource-saving techniques, and hitches in material and technical supplies. This requires the more active involvement of union ministries and departments in restructuring.

The success of any job is ensured in the labor collective, where the primary party organization has the decisive say. Communists are asking: Why has restructuring failed to reach the individual sector, and is the activeness of the working people insufficient? Sociological studies conducted in conjunction with the Social Sciences Academy showed that an improvement in intraparty work is now one of the main conditions for resolving this problem. This situation causes concern among Communists, as indicated by the fact that in the discussion of the CPSU Central Committee Theses, nearly one-half of all the proposals submitted concerned this question.

People are talking more and more frequently and exactingly about the Communist, the party worker, and his personal responsibility for restructuring.

There are different views on the role of the part-time party organization secretary in the context of the shortage of time, especially in collectives working on the basis of economic accountability. The definition of the status of the primary party organization secretary is now an urgent need.

In this connection, I recall the speech delivered by Communist Nikolay Lyashenko, fitter at the Dokuchayev Experimental Demonstration Farm, at a meeting to discuss the Central Committee theses. He is secretary of the shop party organization, a member of the labor collective council, a member of the people's control group, and a deputy on the city soviet. He tries to do each of his duties conscientiously. Naturally, though, he does not have enough time. That is relevant to the question of what a secretary should be and whether he should be full-time. He proposed: "We should not give one man an impossible burden. We must share public work equally among all Communists. That will benefit the cause, and there will be no need to talk about a full-time shop party organization secretary. Let the party leader set a personal example at his workplace, campaigning for the prestige of Communists and for restructuring!"

There was also a discussion of whether there should be a full-time secretary on the basis of the number of Communists in the party organization or the number of workers at a given sector, shop, enterprise, or livestock unit. People listened to him carefully, agreed with him, and then, when they started electing the commission to draft the decisions, once again Lyashenko was the first to be named. The force of inertia remains very great.... Increasing the activeness and responsibility of party members is the most important task we face today. After all, 1 in 10 adults has a party card.

It is no secret that alongside the active Communists and true champions of restructuring, there are also many who regard the payment of membership dues and attendance at meetings as their only duty.

These words came down to us from the distant revolutionary years: bolshevik, commissar, communist. They bear the sacred symbol of the people's conscience and of selfless devotion to socialist ideals. Their original lofty meaning must be restored. That is the unfading significance of the party's moral self-purification.

The forthcoming certification, which must certainly be done, will make many give real thought to their own concrete contribution to restructuring. And it is only proper for many people to be deeply concerned about another question: Why is the title of communist borne by a bureaucrat, a philistine, a formalist, a trimmer? What influence can he have on the party's prestige, nd on people's mood and actions? This situation is no longer tolerable, and the time has come to purge the party of such representatives. But this, which was spoken of yesterday and today, must be done very carefully through a profound study of everyone's career. The problem is that today there are, frankly, excesses in debates, not infrequently reaching the point of absurdity, outright falsification, and occasional insults. This applies particularly to remarks made about party workers. This responsible post in the party has become frankly negative in the understanding of certain people. Who needs that? We should give the matter some thought.

Criticism of anyone should be substantive and constructive. We must fight for the purity of party ranks. However, we must also struggle to prevent losses resulting from defamation and avoid any sort of conjecture or innuendo.

Everyone, for instance, knows about the article published in the latest issue of OGONEK (No 26), "Opposition." It says frankly that some delegates have taken bribes. That is not mentioned in the report of the Credentials Commission, but it does appear in Comrade Korotich's OGONEK. Such things should be said here, to us, the delegates. There must be a limit to the free-and-easy approach to this matter! (applause)

We have all noted, and everyone has been saying, that there were critical moments. At the same time, though, you must not forget the interest shown in the selection of delegates to this truly historic forum, which has assembled after a hiatus of almost 50 years. But in the end, worthy people were elected.

And now a word about the soviets and the enhancement of their role in society. I am familiar with this question; my knowledge is not based on hearsay. It is one of the main topics of discussion, and is directly connected with the further development of socialist democracy and the activation of the human factor. The work of the soviets at local level affects the interests of every Soviet citizen throughout his lifetime. The implementation of people's power through the soviets is one of the key questions of the Leninist concept of socialism. The concrete content of this tenet must be restored. Working people more be more boldly involved in the administration of state and public affairs and must be given a real opportunity to resolve vitally important questions, and to be in charge of the situation in practice.

We can see how far the deformation of the democratic nature of the soviets has gone. Take just one aspect of their multifaceted activities—the solution of key tasks pertaining to the infrastructure of population centers.

Regarding the many problems of the social development of daily life and conditions in cities and villages, soviets are frequently forced to play the role of supplicants, "climbing the ladder" to beg for municipal services from the ministries and departments that attend to these questions in an uncoordinated fashion and on different levels. Here everyone issues orders and acts as the boss, frequently incompetently. Meanwhile, the soviets have no say. Nor can they have any. They are not the boss.

In conditions of economic accountability and self-financing, the problems in this area have multiplied, especially in small cities.

The appropriation of resources for the development of cities and villages must be placed on a legal, normative basis, taking account of the demands of current living standards and enshrining this in a corresponding law. Payments should, as a rule, be made into the local budget. The formulation of normatives for the country's regions must be stepped up.

We must begin to elaborate the 13th 5-Year Plan on the basis of this system and to rid ourselves, at long last, of the residual principle in the planning of capital investments for the development of the social sphere.

The enhancement of the role of the soviets is not an end in itself but merely a necessary means to achieve a radical improvement in the satisfaction of the material, legal, and other requirements of society. The solution of this task makes it possible from the outset to forestall duplication by party committees and to avoid daily petty tutelage over state and economic organs. It also provides an opportunity to focus the attention of the party apparatus on the elaboration of major strategic trends of our development and, ultimately, to raise the role of the party as the political vanguard of society.

Unquestionably, all this must be resolved by means of changes in the structure of the party apparatus from top to bottom with an effective definition of its numerical strength.

The leading role of the center in the development of the country's production forces will undoubtedly be preserved. At the same time, it seems to us that the USSR Gosplan, giving up petty tutelage of territories and sectors, should attend to key, long-term tasks in balancing the socioeconomic development of regions. In the countryside, for instance, land and people must become the main yardstick. We have been taking from people in the countryside for a long time. Now the time has come to get down in earnest to the social restructuring of the countryside. Many proportional indicators in agriculture were established long ago. Can the capital and power levels prescribed for arable land, for instance, be regarded as normal? After all, the social development index of the Altay countryside is between a third and 50 percent lower than the average indicators for the RSFSR. That calls for a profound, scientific reevaluation. The question is not new. We discussed it at the 27th CPSU Congress; somehow we must begin its practical implementation.

Comrades! Today the conference is summing up the important political result of the nationwide discussion. The report contained a critical analysis of the restructuring period. Its complexity is being assessed from profoundly scientific positions, and the strategic direction of our society's future progress is being defined. Undoubtedly, the decisions elaborated by the conference delegates will further accelerate the revolutionary transformations. Thank you for your attention. (applause)

Arbatov Address

PM3006153588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jun 88 Second Edition p 6-7

[Speech by G.A. Arbatov, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the United States and Canada, at 29 June morning session of the 19th All-Union Party Conference: "Comrade G.A. Arbatov's Speech"]

[Text] Comrades, to be honest, when I was preparing my speech, when I asked to be allowed to speak, I was intending to speak about something else, about foreign policy, I wanted to make a number of critical comments regarding the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Defense, and the ministries [as published] of the defense industry in the light of what was said on a general level in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report. But then, last night, after the first day of the conference, I decided that that was not the main thing, it will be possible to raise this question after all in an ordinary working context and talk about it elsewhere, but not from this lofty rostrum.

I want to start with this. The actual tone of the report to this conference, a tone that is not like a directive but invites discussion and is self-critical like the bulk of the speeches in the debate, is sharply different from what I and people of my generation are accustomed to. So many times we have had occasion to rejoice or to pretend to rejoice when things were going badly. And when they began to go better, to rejoice even more, fearing even to ask ourselves the question: How high a price has been paid for a given success?

But now the hour of great changes, an hour of undoubtedly positive change, has arrived. The hour of a return to the truth, of the revival of ideas like honor and the dignity of the individual and the nation. Notions of patriotism and rule by the people so keenly talked and gossiped about are now assuming their real meaning. People are squaring their shoulders and beginning to talk freely and finally take a real part in politics. In short, to do what previously we only dreamed about.

Yet we are not crying "Hurrah!" and "Long live!", we are not getting carried away in rapture, we appreciate that only the first steps have been taken and that we must think not so much about what has been done as about the far greater and far more difficult work that lies ahead. Even on its own this restraint and strictness toward ourselves inspire hope, indeed a fair measure of confidence in the future.

Particularly as, even if we are extremely modest, we are fully entitled to draw conclusions about the enormous significance of what has already been achieved in the course of carrying out restructuring.

History in general is economical and sparing of truly great events. And when the time for such events comes, those who witness them do, even if not immediately, find the necessary criteria to assess the scale and depth of the changes. We, however, are talking about affairs of a truly historic significance. This is clear primarily because it has been possible to halt the processes of social, ideological, political, and economic decline and decay which pushed us to the edge of an abyss which it is terrifying even to glance into. And moreover, the party was able to quickly, in any event for me very quickly, even unexpectedly quickly, revive in many millions of Communists and nonparty people a belief in the triumph of truth, in the future, in the possibility of the victory of our ideals and ideas. A belief which could not but fade and waver when made to run the gauntlet of decades of distortions and deformations, deception of hopes, hypocrisy, and cynicism. Today, and I am convinced of this, we have become not only more honest and purer morally and ideologically but more certain of ourselves, our strength, and our potential. And this certainty is not built on illusions. On the contrary, it is built on the truth, the bitter truth even. And I consider this a great result. It is as if we have managed to loosen and shift an enormous boulder. It will continue to be tough going, but the matter has neverthless been set in motion, and we are aware of this now.

It is in the light of this understanding of the main results of what has already been done that I would like to comment on two noteworthy features of the debate.

The first concerns the ideas about our economy expressed by Leonid Ivanovich Abalkin, an economist whom I respect, deeply respect. I fully agree with him that many very complex and grave problems persist in the national economy. Mikhail Gorbachev, incidentally, talked about this quite clearly in his report. And I also could add much to what he said. But it is my impression, perhaps a mistaken one—however, his words did give rise to this impression—that there was another note present: Namely, that we have not managed to achieve anything in 3 years, that the economy has remained in the same stagnant state. And with that I resolutely disagree. Not only because his arguments did not appear convincing to me; I do not think that the success or lack of success of economic life is determined today by fractions of a percentage point of reduction in resources-intensiveness (moreover, over a very short space of time) or even less by 1 or 2 percentage points in the growth rate.

Something else seems more important to me. The economy and economic reform are not a purely economic matter but are also in the highest degree a political and even ideological matter. A very great deal had to be changed in political ideas and public awareness to shift the boulder of the economy. It was necessary, in particular, to achieve recognition for the role of commodity-monetary relations and the market. After all, precisely toward the sunset of the period of stagnation, attempts were made to finally drive economic science and practice into the impasse of pseudo-Marxist dogmas. I very vividly recall the "guideline [ustanovochnyy] lectures" with which one senior official of the CPSU Central Committee Department of Science and Educational Establishments, who, to cap it all, was a relation of the late Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko, toured the institutes at that time.

Nor surely can one forget how passionately many senior officials who joined commissions under the leadership of the then chairman of the Council of Ministers Tikhonov fulminated with bad language against every attempt to revive economic methods of managing the economy and lost their temper at everything that reminded them of the market—the Hungarian, Yugoslav, or Chinese experiment? And if we had suggested to them then the idea of the family contract, cooperative activity, or individual labor activity, the outcome would generally have been apoplexy.

And surely we felt the heavy spiritual legacy of those times even after restructuring began? I am thinking of the great excesses that began after the notable resolution on unearned income. And how we still today have to wage a tough fight against wage-leveling sentiments, do we not?

Surely this cannot all be forgotten? I think that it is not an exaggeration to say that we have achieved very considerable results in creating the political, spiritual, and moral prerequisites for economic reform. Leaving aside the free, creative economic discussion, which has in a short space of time provided a whole galaxy of new names, including that of Leonid Ivanovich Abalkin, discussion that has enlightened both theoreticians and practicians in the national economy and stirred economic, I would even say, state thinking and the creative initiative of many millions of Soviet working people.

And in general only spiritually liberated and thinking people, freed moreover from the fetters of the bureaucratic yoke (applause), can successfully develop the economy.

Thus we have surely made major steps forward in this short period. So that for the economy too the years of restructuring have not been for nothing. Although we wanted and could have achieved more. And it is good we criticize ourselves for this slackening of pace.

There are major questions here. I think that among the plenums which are urgently needed, one must be devoted to these economic questions. These include questions which have not even been seriously discussed. For example, structural questions of the economy, the correlation of the inordinately expanded group "A" and the very modest group "B," the incorrect correlation between the extractive and the processing industries, the obsession with size which is apparent even today, including in the deals that we conclude with Americans, pushing enormous resources into something, not knowing when it will begin to yield a return or if it will ever yield a return at all.

Another question: The monopoly prevailing in our country is terrifying. And, after all, monopoly always leads to decay, including under socialism. We need competition, socialist competition [konkurentsiya]. There are also problems regarding prices and many other matters.

But, comrades, this is all quite natural, this is all now free and open for discussion, and I think that all these questions can be solved.

Another aspect I would like to talk about concerns glasnost and the mass media.

Of course, the newspapers, radio, and television can and must be criticized when they merit it. And sometimes they do. But I think I detected in some speeches notes of nostalgia for the good old days of "ideological comfort," when the mass media were quiet, tame, and inoffensive. It was very convenient to work. I know for myself: No one finds it pleasant to be criticized.

But, comrades, surely we have not forgotten the lessons of Rashidov, Medunov, Shchelokov, Grishin, the great number of miscarriages of justice, and the altogether savage campaigns, in terms of our present-day notions, against enemies of the people and the followers of Mendel and Morgan [American biologist, researcher into theory of heredity], killer doctors, and the pseudoscience of cybernetics? And absurd and ruinous economic decisions such as the reversal of the flow of the Siberian rivers? Yet all of this became possible because, among other things, we lived under conditions of lack of glasnost and an obedient press.

In my view, the party's plan is plain: To cleanse itself, to tell the truth, the whole truth, even the bitter truth, to remove the obstructions blocking the way ahead, and to ensure the victory of socialism. And the main thing is that the weapon here is glasnost and democracy. Of course a high sense of responsibility is needed. It is necessary to strive to avoid making even a single error but, if you do, to honestly acknowledge it. It is necessary to grant to those who dispute what is said in the press the right of reply. After all we have courts and laws which mete out punishment for slander and defamation of Soviet citizens.

But, comrades, we must not at the same time, on the grounds that a particular press organ makes mistakes or commits breaches, try to suppress glasnost and throw out the baby with the bath water. In short, both critics and the criticized must learn standards of polemical debate, political standards.

Comrade Gorbachev in his report talks about the responsibility of the press very well, in my opinion. But he also talks about something else there, about the fact that instances of punishment for criticism and of suppression of the press have still not been eradicated. And the main idea of that section, which expresses the thrust of the Central Committee stance, lies in the following quotation: "The mass media act today as a powerful rostrum for public opinion. They have done quite a lot to restore historical truth and justice, to criticize shortcomings and omissions, to disseminate experience of restructuring, and develop in people the ability to think and act in a new, creative, and singleminded way."

I think that one is bound to agree with that. Neither democratization nor restructuring is possible without glasnost. (applause).

I would like to conclude by talking about the proposals for political reform expressed in the report. I wholly approve of the spirit, the thrust, and the aims of those proposals. It seems to me that our political structures have ossified. They were so adapted to bureaucratic deformations and bureaucratic practice that they

became something akin to well-worn carpet slippers—to the great comfort of the bureaucrats. It seemed democratic in form but they learned to do very craftily all that they need and want. We must undoubtedly leave this position behind, we need very serious, radical changes in our political structures.

In his report Comrade Gorbachev put the question of such changes very tactfully, in my opinion: Let us, comrades, consult one another, this question must be discussed, let us think about it. And undoubtedly we will still have time to think before the adoption of the resolution and afterwards regarding some questions up until the conference proposals become law and legal norms; for the moment I would like to express a few preliminary considerations.

I think that it is correct in principle for first secretaries to be subsequently elected as chairmen of soviets. But certain questions here need more thought, particularly the question of whether the new procedure should in principle bar nonparty people access to leadership of a soviet, say, for a rayon and perhaps even in some cases an oblast soviets. Perhaps some sort of proviso should be made on this score. Last year's January plenum correctly said nonparty people must play a greater role in political life.

Regarding elections, I think that it is necessary to make the practice of elections to soviets really democratic. Perhaps then it will also be possible to try the practice whereby a party committee selects and proposes two or three candidates whom Communists find acceptable as leaders of the party organization of a rayon or oblast and then give the soviet the opportunity to elect from among them. Not just confirm but elect. After all, I think that our political system will be constantly developing.

Now for the term of office for the top leadership, the leadership in general. I think that two terms must be introduced and without any exceptions. (applause) We can rightly consider as one of our achievments in improving the political atmosphere and morals and in the style of our behavior the fact that in the period of restructuring it has become a sign of very bad form and political taste to praise leaders. And I wholly welcome that. I think that when comrades talk about making an exception for the top rank, they are thinking of Comrade Gorbachev and adapting the future legislative norm in terms of our present leader. I do understand them here. But at the same time we must not consider the personal merits of one man when introducing a norm but must bear the principle in mind. And here the experience of history must be taken into account And I think that this experience teaches us that if the rule of two terms had existed I.V. Stalin would have retired in January 1934, even before the murder of Kirov. And Brezhnev would have retired in October 1974. In both cases our country would have been able to avoid paying such a very great price. (applause)

Ulyanov, Gorbachev Exchange

PM3006171088 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jun 88 Second Edition pp 7-8

[Speech by M.A. Ulyanov, chairman of the RSFSR Theater Workers Union Board, at 29 June morning session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference]

[Text] In general, everything seems to have been said, both in depth and in detail; both in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report and in the innumerable press articles which we are all reading so avidly. A great deal has already been done in our culture, and a great deal has been and is being done to liberate spiritual progress and straighten things out. I could have refrained from making a speech; I could have said nothing. But for some reason there is a sense of alarm in my soul.

Our millions-strong people are waiting outside this palace; they are waiting to see what the conference will decide and what fundamental decisions it will take. They are waiting, it must be said, with an immense craving and desire. The speeches of certain delegates have again contained assurances, vows, and promises to resolve all tasks. And, according to these speeches, the only thing hindering this is the press. So we have only to reproach it, and then everything will be alright. Is that so?

It is true that this is a historic time. Today we, like the hero of the fairy tale, are choosing the only correct path. The other roads lead to destruction. We have chosen this path. Today history is breathing alongside us. True, until quite recently we were accustomed to everything, or nearly everything, in this country being called historic. Any even slightly sensible decision—and often even decisions that were not altogether sensible—was called historic. But today is indeed a point in the history of our life when we must choose one way or another. The conference will either fulfill the will and aspirations of the people, who have long passionately wanted to live and work in a country with clearly expressed laws which nobody can change or repeal as long as they reflect the people's interests and have been approved by the will of the people, or we will again flinch at imperious cries. We would not have the slightest guarantee against any arbitrary [volevo-prikaznyy] bans, confiscations, punishments, or lawlessness on a local—and not just local—level, total license for the bureaucracy, and the omnipotence of the party and economic apparatus, which until recently lived according to the merchants' principle of "I'll do what I like." Sometimes these smart merchants covered up their lawlessness with rags of demagoguery, but often they did not even use this camouflage, so confident were they that people would put up with it and keep quiet. And the bitter truth is that people did put up with it and did keep quiet.

We will have either the diktat of the apparatchik, with all the ensuing consequences—right up to cults and repression—or people's power, where what will reign will not be tyranny, voluntarism, and stagnation, but legality,

constitutional guarantees, and the immutable right of the people to participate in the structure of their own lives rather than be mute "cogs."

Stalin toasted the "cogs" in 1945. But in 1921 Vladimir Ilich wrote in PRAVDA, in his article "On Purging the Party": "Of course, we do not submit to all the masses' directives, since the masses sometimes give way to... by no means advanced sentiments. But in assessments of people and in negative attitudes to 'hangers-on,' 'self-important commissars,' and 'bureaucratically minded people' the directives of the nonparty proletarian masses, and in many cases the directives of the nonparty peasant masses, are supremely valuable. The masses of the working people are supremely sensitive to the difference between honest and devoted Communists and those who inspire revulsion... Cleansing the party in the light of the directives of nonparty working people is a great task. It will produce major results and make the party a far stronger class vanguard than before..." Thus, Stalin was in favor of "cogs"; Lenin found "the directives of the nonparty proletarian masses... supremely valuable." There are two positions for you.

Today is a watershed. History has come close to us and is hopefully looking us in the eye: Don't go wrong, don't lose courage, don't be scared! People, today you can still do a great deal; tomorrow may be too late! Be clever, and it won't be some stranger who will decide things for us—we ourselves must defend and strengthen democracy and the people's power; there is no other force. We—the people and the party—must ourselves defend and strengthen the rights and laws under which we can live without fear and be confident of the future. Either we create a situation in which democracy exists as the oxygen of life, where talent and labor are prized rather than a position on the nomenklatura and complaisance, and where life promotes people who are businesslike, intelligent, independent, and able to work without prompting or pestering, or we will again sell our wealth in order to eke out a living, hunt culprits, and ban any freedom of thought. This has already happened before, and everyone sitting here knows only too well what it resulted in.

If restructuring is defeated, peace will cease to exist. The fate of peace is hanging by a thread and directly depends on the success of restructuring. The stronger we are, the calmer things will be in the world. That is being said worldwide. It is understood by any U.S. senator. But the main thing for our homegrown administrators is that they keep hold of the post from which they can issue commands—everything else can go hang. Regrettably, this is not an exaggeration by some scared intellectual, but reality in all its drama.

But just who is stopping us from doing what has been clearly and sensibly proposed? People all over are saying and writing: bureaucratism, bureaucratism, and bureaucrats. Just what kind of invisible and incomprehensible creature is this? We all know about them, but nobody's ever seen one. A real abominable snowman! There are loads of tracks; everything is trampled down, but no one has set eyes on one. (Applause). Like an evil spirit, as people used to say. Fair enough, in the past people were very ignorant, though hard-working; they fed themselves and believed in "evil spirits." (Laughter. Applause). But we are meant to be civilized people. It is quite deplorable if there is a decision, as clever, knowledgeable experts say, about state orders which stifles all initiative in the enterprise and literally ruins it, if ministries retain the right to dream up any normatives to grab up to 90 percent of a successful enterprise's profits, and if cooperative members are subjected to such a smothering net of progressive taxation that the entire cooperative movement—which we need so badly—starts to choke, and cooperative members chuck it all in and go off to play dominos.

But these laws are thought up by people—they have names, and there are posts in rising to which they assiduously saw away at the branch on which we are barely sitting. This means that there is no power or authority that can stop this "economical economy." How else can we explain the fact that the marvelous inventions of our geniuses and "moonlighters" [levshi] have not been put to use for years? How else are we to understand the veritable cry of Mikhail Grigoryevich Vagin, that cleverest of chairmen: Let me work freely. Arkadiy Filimonovich Veprev, director of a very famous sovkhoz, also asks to be given a free hand. They are asking for something simple: to be allowed to work in peace and to feed people. But officials hang around them like a pack of hounds around a bear, and undermine them with their instructions. (Applause).

How can we tolerate the fact that most of our industrial items and products are not competitive in the world market and that we are so far behind technically, so experts tell us? Are we really so ham-fisted and brainless? Who or what is impeding outstanding natural talents, common sense, logic, and, ultimately, our own advantage? Why are our bureaucrats so all-powerful? Bureaucrats are all-powerful because they triumph not by logic or better decisions, but by dint of their usurped authority. Having seized power, they surround themselves with those like them and hand on their power to nobody. This is why the nomenklatura was dreamed up, it is like a caste of untouchables. And it was not thought up today, it was thought up at a time when many bad things for us were thought up. Hence the striking adaptability and amazing unsinkability of the nomenklatura, hence also the stifling of everything talented, since comparisons are not to the bureaucrats' advantage. Hence also the eulogies—the semblance of work has to be created. Hence the endless sessions and conferences, since bureaucrats are only strong when pounding water in a mortar. The semblance of work: A decision has been made! Hence the endless stream of paper which, like a mountain torrent, douses and drenches all life. But this is precisely what administrators need. When the people are held in prohibitory fetters, then bureaucrats are strong, all-powerful, and invincible. Hence the total license, hence the

lack of controls, and hence the closed and secret nature of the party and economic apparatus. All this may again lead to a cult—perhaps even more savage and cruel. And why not? Do we today have legal, juridical, political, and constitutional guarantees, rights, and laws that protect us from possible uncontrolled administration by decree, let alone cults? No. And the most important task for the people and the party is to find, to find at all costs and work out legal guarantees that would be an insuperable obstacle to any evil lover of issuing orders, scaring the people, and spilling blood. And the fact that this is absolutely realistic is shown by the bitter and rather terrifying episode of Nina Andreyeva's letter. This article caught us unawares. Many—not all, but many—jumped to attention and awaited their next orders.

M.S. Gorbachev: Mikhail Aleksandrovich, she has sent us a letter. Right here, it has just arrived, we have just been given it. The presidium members will read the letter. She is sticking to her guns.

M.A. Ulyanov: Well, there you are! But she is not the point, the point is us, the fact that we were scared by her letter. This is what is terrifying. (Applause) And had those instructions appeared, people would immediately have rushed to obey them, without thinking, without hesitating. Since it has appeared in the newspaper, it must be an instruction. Even though their hearts might have been aching, the overwhelming majority were rooted to the spot and awaited directives. They realized that this was wrong, but they waited, they trembled but waited patiently, obediently, with a sense of forebodeing. And how would our conference today have gone had it not been for the PRAVDA article which shook us from our numbness, public silence, and waiting? See how deeply blind obedience and mindless assiduity have eaten into us! Aleksandr Sergeyevich [Pushkin] wrote this 150 years ago:

"Woe to the country where slaves and flatterers
"Are the only ones close to the throne,
"While the poet chosen by heaven
"Keeps silent, with downcast eyes."

The article stunned us for a while. It became clear that we are still afraid "to dare to have our own opinion." Fine, you can understand people during the cult time: They were afraid for their lives. You can understand people during the time of voluntarism: They had faith in Khrushchev without reservation. You can understand people in the time of stagnation, when they had no faith in anything, seeing the universal lies and thievery. But what are we waiting for now? What stops us taking a firm stance now, when our hands have been untied and our souls have been released? Is it again that accursed fear which sits in our genes? It was correctly said: Restructuring must begin with ourselves. But I think that, without legal, economic, political, and juridical levers capable of creating a state based on the rule of law, we will be unable to change ourselves. Without legal foundations, the human factor will not play any role. This is what I think.

A couple of words about the way the theater is currently lagging behind life, for which we are rightly criticized. For some reason, it seems that the theater in the past always responded to the demands of the time and instantly produced shows reflecting life, but now it does this either not at all or, at least, not enough. But let us not forget how often in the past we declared the events of the time, how often our successes on stage were guaranteed by timeserving. And even though we vowed to ourselves that ideological commitment must be artistically expressed in life, topicality was more often than not considered the main merit in life. Artistic considerations went by the wayside—since topicality was very highly valued and rewarded, man, being weak, duly served up topicality.

Of course, there were profound and talented works, I am not talking about those. Nor am I talking now about the difficulty they had in gaining acceptance.

The main point, dear comrades, is this: Was there ever in the last few years a time when everything was up in the air, everything was being subjected to analysis and the quest for ways out of the blind alley into which we were driven by the cult policy and the stagnation policy.

At that time, everything seemed clear: Here is an enemy of the people, here is a hero of the country, here is a kulak, here is an aktiv member, here is a White, here is a Red. Everything was clear. But now just try to figure out who is "White" and who is "Red." A very complicated matter. (Applause) Now we are living in an unusual time, it frightens many people. Some are confused, some are malicious, some are biding their time to bring the people, who are talking more than they should, back to their senses. Now the time is both encouraging and difficult.

And the main point is that journalism is stronger than any detective stories. The famous Maigret is not fit to hold a candle to Gdlyan, who is working in Uzbekistan as investigator of especially important cases. Maigret! What is Maigret in comparison with what he is uncovering there! (Laughter) Art is like an exhalation, but unless you breathe in some air, there is nothing to exhale. The theater has never abandoned life, and it will not abandon it now. Together with the entire country, the theater is figuring things out, comparing, seeking, and already doing a lot. The creative unions are doing a lot. There is much to be said on this topic, but I know that you will start hand-clapping and will not even let me cite figures. Obviously, everyone on this rostrum is a scientist. (Applause)

But I would venture to make several proposals. I think it is necessary, either at the conference or after it, to set up a special commission headed by the general secretary and comprising representatives of the broadest possible range of the people and scientists in order to elaborate a system for elections to the party apparatus and the state apparatus.

The experience of elections for the 19th conference revealed the urgent need for such a step. Elections must express the interests of the people and nominate people who are truly talented, bold, loyal, and competent. Nominate and vote, rather than appoint and have the appointment confirmed by a small group. A sensibly worked out election system will save us from the voluntarism of the apparatus and from the confusion in people's heads, which also exists.

Here is my second proposal, which really kept me awake all last night. I will find it difficult to make it, but I will make it nevertheless. The proposal on terms of office in any post in the party and in state and economic work is correct and vitally necessary. Then suddenly there was a proposal: By way of an exception, nomination for a third term, in other words for 15 years. But 15 years is a considerable period.

You know, comrades, that whenever the cracks of an exception appear in our country, the floodgates open soon afterward, everybody rushes through at once, and everybody is exceptionally exceptional. (Applause)

For the sake of true democratization, for the sake of improving life, I propose that one term be the rule, with election for a second term open to candidates who receive at least two-thirds of votes in a secret ballot with the necessary participation of one or several competing candidates, who would also appear on the ballot paper. (Applause)

But we need Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev as general secretary for as long as possible. Our democratic barriers are still too weak to stop us feeling afraid of some misfortune in the form of a "father and teacher." (Applause) But we have faith in Gorbachev. I therefore propose that, as an extraordinary decision, Gorbachev alone be elected for a third term. (Applause) This is an exception and not a rule, because a social revolution is now under way. In a revolution, you don't change horses in midstream, so to speak. Leaders must not be changed at a time of such extremely serious efforts.

I should like to raise another question which will probably not be supported, but I shall venture to raise it anyway. I believe that the editors of central, oblast, and kray newspapers and, in the republics, of republic and oblast newspapers should be elected at congresses and plenums. That will protect them against the heavy hand of the oblast or republic leadership. Newspapers are too closely linked to the local authorities and are thus dependent and have no voice. But without a free and bold press, democracy and glasnost are inconceivable too. (Applause)

We have a one-party system but in nature everything is founded on the principle of the struggle of opposites. This is where we need a press which, as a countervailing force, can also fulfill the role of an opposite if the need arises.

There is one thing I do not understand. We proclaim criticism and self-criticism as a means of cleansing ourselves. Well, things are clear with regard to self-criticism. The word is self-criticism, it means you criticize yourself. That is difficult but tolerable. But who is supposed to criticize us? Otherwise you end up with self-criticism again. Throughout the world it is this—or rather, also this—which newspapers and magazines do. Well, who if not a newspaper or magazine is going to criticize and cover events, take the side of the weak and the injured, seek out truth, and simply keep open a window on the world? That is how it is done throughout the world. That is natural. But how is it possible to reconcile the demands to intensify criticism and the rigid demand to silence a newspaper if it, God forbid, dares to criticize someone? "Some hack dares to criticize an elected worker!" it was recently said from this platform. You can lose faith in restructuring after statements like that. Throughout the world newspapers have always been the keenest weapon, but in our country some comrades would like to keep the whole press in their pocket.

What chance is there of restructuring if a newspaper is banned from being a mirror reflecting our whole world in all its beautiful and not so beautiful diversity? No, dear comrades, if we are to restructure ourselves it is also necessary to restructure our attitude toward the newspaper as a "lady agreeable in all respects." No, the press is an independent and major force, not the timid handmaiden of certain comrades who have become accustomed to living and leading without control. It is that which we also want to combat.

M.S. Gorbachev: The question which you have raised, Mikhail Aleksandrovich, is very important. If we refuse to promote the process of glasnost, criticism, self-criticism, and democracy, restructuring will die. We have firmly opted for the path of glasnost and must follow it unwaveringly. Here is why. First, our system is a people's system and the people must take part in organizing society's life through the political process, through the possibility of expressing their viewpoint, of conveying their opinion to everyone, and of criticizing the unworthy and shortcomings. And thereby be schooled in participation in the management of affairs. This is clear, and we must go further in this direction.

But when G.A. Arbatov quoted this part of my report or, rather, the CPSU Central Committee's report, in his speech, he stopped short. Had he gone further he would have seen that the report said: We now need a party press of a new quality. When Vladimir Ilich Lenin spoke about glasnost, he warned that glasnost means plain talking without literary embellishment. (Applause) The conference must say in an honest and party-minded way that this is really a question of the country's fate and of how we are going to live in the future and how we are going to build our relations.

In the past some people monopolized the mass media, and we all know how that ended. And now we can see how another group of people are trying stealthily to monopolize the press as the tribune of all the people. We want a pluralism of opinions. That is why there must be an opportunity for different viewpoints to be expressed and then the whole spectrum of moods and problems will become clearer and on that basis a solution will emerge.

M.A. Ulyanov: We have two monopolies now. One at local level...

M.S. Gorbachev: That's the point: We must not replace one monopoly with another, one half-truth with another half-truth. We need the whole truth like life itself, we must know it and restructure it on socialist principles, on the principles of our morality and not to benefit another monopoly group. Generally speaking, at a time when we are determining the line of how we are to live in the future we should be thinking not about who will occupy what post tomorrow but about the country and the country's fate. Then we shall find the truth. (Applause)

The difference between the local press and the central press contains two aspects. On the one hand, the local press was slower in taking the path of restructuring and has still not fully developed the potential of glasnost and democracy. That is correct. But on the other hand it avoided the bad points which the central press sometimes presented to us. A man can be insulted in our newspapers and magazines. Is this permissible in a socialist society? The conference must speak resolutely about this, but at the same time it is necessary to preserve glasnost and criticism as a form of permanent, active exchange of opinions in the country. Otherwise we shall not resolve the tasks facing us. In my view there are no disagreements between us, Mikhail Aleksandrovich.

M.A. Ulyanov: May I ask you a question, Mikhail Sergeyevich?

M.S. Gorbachev: Please do.

M.A. Ulyanov: Are you in favor of their being no mistakes, no insulting people, and therefore of belittling the press or, on the contrary, if I understood you correctly, of elevating the press even if we do make mistakes? There may be mistakes in this struggle...

M.S. Gorbachev: Mikhail Aleksandrovich, since we are saying that the main lesson of the past is that the people were removed from the process of social life and the process of formulating and making decisions, then today we must involve the people in these affairs via political democracy, the press, and social organizations. At the same time we cannot allow the press—that rostrum of all the people—to become the department of another group. In the past there was one group, now there is another. That is the issue. This must be discerned. (Prolonged applause)

I see no divergences, I even welcome the fact that you began this discussion because you have given me an opportunity to join in it. There must be absolute clarity here. If someone is stung by criticism in the press and he feels discomfort at this but the criticism is fair—well, he must accept it, go to people, explain to them why things are the way they are, and think about how to put matters right. Then our party will live. And under a one-party system we shall have democracy such as has never been dreamed of by those abroad who pass themselves off as a model of democracy or who would like to do so. And there are many of them in the world now.

M.A. Ulyanov: It is perfectly right that the press is a powerful weapon that must be used skillfully and in the interests of the people and the party.

M.S. Gorbachev: Correct. (Applause)

M.A. Ulyanov: But it is also a weapon that can chastise. This, too, is the truth.

My dear comrades in restructuring, you see what a very rare, magnificent, historic opportunity we have. What potential for renewing our whole life, what light of hope is burning in the eyes of a people who have suffered too much. So will we really give in again, for the third time, to the mindless bureaucratic machine, again put on the yoke of stifling dogmatism, and again keep ourselves in check with the lip-tearing bridle of prohibition! No, let us not forget what the so-called period of stagnation cost the people. We must not speak calmly of the cult. Having believed in Khrushchev and the thaw of the fifties and sixties and then being thrown back once again by the period of stagnation under Brezhnev, a period of the monstrous flowering of corruption, bribetaking, ignorance, and simply brute vulgarity which took the form of a shameful game of presenting awards, the people threw up their hands and did whatever they liked, just to submerge themselves in something. It was during those years that the people's terrible hard drinking began, and it is still being encouraged in every way. So, what form might the third disappointment take, if we do not win this hard battle? If such a thing were to happen, we would never be forgiven by our children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren. I do not want people ever to say of us the bitter and terrible words of Vladimir Ilich Lenin: "The revolutionary phrase about revolutionary war destroyed the revolution." (Applause)

Marchuk Speech

PM0107105388 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jul 88 Second Edition pp 2-3

[Speech by G.I. Marchuk, president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, at 29 June afternoon session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference]

[Text] Esteemed Comrades! The complex and irreversible processes of restructuring have been under way for 3 years. We all realize that there is no alternative to it,

although there are many difficulties in this area. We scientists participate in this process above all in our own sphere of activity—science. And many problems have built up in this area.

I will start with the fact that the state of affairs in our country's science really arouses serious concern. Essentially, for the last few decades the ties between science and the national economy have been broken, as have those between science and education. The role of science in society's life has fallen sharply, its own potential has diminished, and the analysis of this situation made in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report is entirely correct.

Is Soviet science ready to resolve the responsible tasks which restructuring is posing? Not entirely, I think. I would like to explain this. Above all I would like to make a certain analysis, but before this to stress that fundamental scientific research is the basis of all science and all scientific and technical progress. It defines the prospects for 10-20 years hence, it achieves the breakthroughs both in the production sphere and in the sphere of knowledge of nature and society.

Let us compare the potential in our fundamental science with the corresponding U.S. potential. We will see that the number of U.S. scientific workers employed on fundamental research is twice as high as in our country. Although the overall number of of scientific workers in both countries' science is approximately the same. The capital-labor ratio of U.S. scientific workers in the United States is higher than ours—at least three times higher.

This means that our real potential for fundamental research is approximately 5 times lower than America's. This is also shown by spending for these purposes. Such spending in the United States amounts to 15 billion dollars, whereas we spend R2 billion. I would add to this that the U.S. Government, striving to win world technological leadership from Japan, has decided to double allocations for fundamental research, taking them up to 30 billion dollars a year by 1992.

Hence it is clear that our competition in science is becoming even more difficult. That is why we have constantly been forced to catch up, that is why the gap is widening—yet our country has highly talented scientists and major, world-class scientific schools.

The questions of the material and financial base of science are central. The state budget has been, is, and will continue to be the main source for financing fundamental research. Think about it yourselves—after all, nobody but the state will pay for what science will give society in 10-15 years time. Yet without this we would have had no polymers, televisions, robots, lasers, computers, or many other things.

It is very advantageous to invest funds in fundamental science. This is attested by world experience and our own Soviet experience. On average, the economic effect is equivalent to R10 per ruble of expenditure. Incidentally, Academician Ye.I. Chazov spoke about this as applied to medicine. And it is the same everywhere. And although this effect sometimes emerges only after many years, its total size in subsequent years is very large.

I will cite just one example. Our Soviet physicist, Academician Petr Leonidovich Kapitsa, created the technology for obtaining liquid oxygen from the air, on the basis of which oxygen blasting started to be extensively employed in metallurgy. There are many metallurgists here. They know this. By the most modest estimates, this work alone has produced R500 million in profit for the national economy.

We could also recall the work on welding, lasers, polymers, composite materials, and many other things. Incidentally, we at the Academy of Sciences are currently examining innovations which exist nowhere else and will lead to revolutions in national economic spheres. Here is an example. At the last Academy of Sciences Presidium Academician A.S. Spirin proposed an entirely new, noncellular method of biotechnology. This marks a new generation in biotechnology, and we are in at the start of it. We just need support, above all in bringing this work to the fundamental level, and later implementing it. The key to obtaining a major effect, Comrades, lies in introduction on an extensive scale. Ultimately, this is the main source of finance for science itself. If large additional profits are created, then part of those profits should go on developing fundamental research—every highly developed state does this. We must assimilate this process, and then we will always be equal to the latest achievements of scientific and technical progress.

We should review our entire long-term scientific policy from this standpoint. As for the next 2 years, the USSR Council of Ministers is examining proposals for substantially increasing the funds available for fundamental research, but we must also have a large, global view of the future.

But it is not just a question of financing. The fate of science is indissolubly linked with the resolution of the problem being discussed at this party conference—the democratization of all aspects of our society's life. First and foremost, because science cannot develop in a static, undemocratic, and stagnant society—it just suffocates. The similarity between the ills of science and society simultaneously means that the concept of revolutionary transformations being discussed at the conference is directly relevant to science.

In order to achieve tangible successes in resolving the aforementioned problems we will have to do work that is immense in both scale and complexity. I would like to state bluntly that the creation of the most favorable environment for scientific development requires above

all a review of the attitudes taken to it by science and its political institutions. This was quite correctly stated in Mikhail Sergeyevich's report. Genuine scientific development is impossible without a sufficiently high level of scientific independence within the system of social ties and relations. It must be free of petty tutelage and any kind of control by the management apparatus, and it must be entirely able to act independently on all questions relating to its own process and to the entire socioeconomic and political process. And if today we are making it our aim to turn working people into the genuine masters of production, it is just as important to make scientists their own masters in science. Under the conditions of restructuring it is more important than ever for scientists to have high civic responsibility and to be acutely receptive to society's problems and needs. And this cannot be achieved without consolidating our science's healthy forces on the basis of restructuring and preventing lack of coordination based on disciplinary, regional, or other narrow departmental interests. And the Academy of Sciences will firmly follow this route.

The internationalization of scientific knowledge has become a powerful factor in strengthening the interdependence of the modern world. In this regard the fall in our proportional contribution to world science cannot fail to be alarming. Involvement in world science is an important source for shaping new scientific avenues and rapidly building up cognitive potential under modern conditions; the desire not to be isolated from world science is a no less important aim than holding onto the lead in a particular area.

I would link the creation of a new setup for Soviet science with two strategic goals. The first is the democratization of the work of all components of the Academy of Sciences. The second is the search for new forms and mechanisms for organizing scientific research.

Science more than any other sphere needs the clash of ideas, opinions, and approaches. Here more than anywhere else monopolism is deadly. Only rivalry and competition between scientific schools and their extensive international cooperation are capable of creating a powerful domestic impetus for scientific development.

The steps we have already taken in this direction are meeting with resistance, and therefore things are very difficult for us. But we must ensure rivalry between scientific programs and competitive election to and removal from all scientific administrative posts, right up to president. And we will be discussing this at the Academy of Sciences general meeting in September. But we need extensive glasnost, discussions, and exchanges of experience in this area. Despite the fact that the mass media give us our fair share of attention—and we thank them for that—we now feel the lack of a weekly all-union newspaper specially devoted to science. The USSR Academy of Sciences is submitting a proposal to set one up. Scientists asked for this at a meeting with conference delegates.

But there are also other important questions of the restructuring of academic science, which are being energetically discussed by the scientific public. The report and speeches at the party conference have already mentioned that restructuring has not yet reached the lowest organizational levels. This applies fully to the Academy of Sciences too. It is a particularly important factor, Comrades, that our institutes grew extensively for many years but have now outlived the structure which once seemed quite natural. Now we need an abrupt transformation. We must make the basic structural components of institutes flexible. We have only taken the first steps so far, and it must be said that not all of the steps in our academy have been consistent. But we do not know how better to proceed. We are probing, experimenting. We are abolishing previously accepted principles if they prove unjustified. But this a natural process which is generally typical of restructuring in all spheres.

In the past 2-3 years the lowest components—scientific laboratories and departments—have experienced cadre changes as a result of democratization and the election of directors and subunit chiefs. But laboratories have not received any more modern instruments, scarce reagents, or computer equipment, nor have their premises been expanded. There have been no noticeable improvements in the social sphere. This gives rise to a certain distrust of the processes that are taking place. We see the way out in the sharp expansion of the independence and responsibility of the main component—laboratories—by granting them the right to control their own financial and material resources and sharply increasing material and technical supply. (Applause).

Allow me nonetheless to put you in what I would call a constructive mood, because I think that what is currently being done in science may puzzle you. We talk about breakthroughs in key areas of scientific and technical progress. The report mentioned this. But it is here that competition among the industrially developed countries is at its sharpest. It is in these areas that major scientific and technical programs in the United States, Japan, and West Europe are focused. And we too cannot abandon these areas. There is also the CEMA Comprehensive Program, which requires particularly great attention.

Comrades, a great role in scientific development is currently played by the regions. In order to distribute academic science equally the USSR Academy of Sciences has set up several new scientific departments and scientific centers—the Far Eastern Scientific Department of the Academy of Sciences together with the Siberia and Urals Departments comprise an enormous formation of academic science taking in our country's entire eastern area. A new scientific center has been set up on the Kola Peninsula. There is a large program for scientific and technical progress in the union republics as well as in Moscow, Leningrad, and other cities.

So, in summing up all these thoughts, I would like to say that the range of problems linked with the scientific backup for restructuring is very wide. They were first

examined in depth at the June conference in 1985. A great deal was done. However, today's situation requires particular attention to these problems of the whole party. I am convinced that it would be right and timely to devote a special Central Committee plenum to scientific development.

Let us think a little more about the fact that restructuring is our country's launching pad on the threshold of its entry into the 21st century. It would be no exaggeration to say that science's contribution will determine to an enormous extent our country's place and role in the future high-tech, automated world community that will have risen to a new level of development. However, this place and role will be determined not only by the fruits of scientific research but by the scale of their practical utilization during our restructuring.

Comrades! The 19th party conference is shaping the strategy for revealing Soviet society's creative potential. We scientists are sure that our science must become a most important element in the process of revolutionary renewal—and we are striving to ensure that it does. (Applause).

Armenia's Arutyunyan Speaks

PM0107094188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jul 88 Second Edition p 3

[Speech by S.G. Arutyunyan, first secretary of Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, at 29 June evening session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference]

[Text] Esteemed Comrades! You will agree that an atmosphere of frank, creative debate is reigning at our conference. The report by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, set a good tone for our party forum and has exerted a decisive influence on all its work. The report inspires confidence and, I would say, a sense of optimism. And we have grounds for this. The transformations now being implemented by the party, unlike the former, one-sided reforms, are comprehensive and scientifically substantiated, embrace literally all spheres of society's life, and are shaking up deep strata of our life.

Armenia's working people wholeheartedly welcome the party's policy of restructuring and acceleration. But we delegates from the local level are well aware that restructuring is proceeding in an uneven and contradictory fashion, via an acute struggle of new against old.

Our republic had everything required to take its place in the vanguard ranks of the struggle to implement the party's new course. But it turned out that in many respects the period after April 1985 was a continuation of the years of stagnation for Armenia. An extremely paradoxical situation was created. The desire of the masses, their restructuring spirit, and their vigorous rejection of stagnant, negative phenomena ran up against the conservatism of the republic leadership. The leadership, painful though it may be to acknowledge the fact now, not only was unable to head the masses but to some extent trailed behind and lost the initiative. Moreover, it became a kind of braking mechanism, although there was no shortage of talk of restructuring.

The situation in the economy and the distortion of many aspects of social, ideological, and moral life caused serious concern and alarm among the working people. However, the atmosphere was such that, as a rule, this was mentioned timidly, with things left unsaid. It was only after justified criticism of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee leadership was voiced at the CPSU Central Committee June (1987) Plenum that stagnant thought was set in motion, people began to breathe more easily, and their social activeness increased.

At party committee plenums, meetings, and rallies Communists, workers, kolkhoz members, and members of the intelligentsia began to fiercely criticize negative phenomena, the practice of protectionism, and the promotion of cadres on the basis of personal devotion and often demanded the resignation of the leadership. A couple of months ago one collective took a banner reading "Down with corrupt bureaucrats!" to the May Day demonstration in Yerevan. That emerging voice is a characteristic sign. The time when, as the famous stage direction in Pushkin's "Boris Godunov" says, "the people are silent" is departing from our life, never to return.

Instead of reacting correctly to the just criticism, soberly assessing the situation, and embarking on resolving tasks connected with restructuring and renewal, the republic tried to get away with cosmetic measures, mimicry, and the creation of a mirage of restructuring. Socialist ideological and moral values were devalued in some people's minds. Phenomena such as the embezzlement of socialist property, window dressing, bribe-taking, a contemptuous attitude toward the law, and a consumerist mentality took root.

The republic's Communists and working people are well aware that sharp criticism of shortcomings and the exposure of negative phenomena alone are not enough to implement radical changes. You also need a clear, constructive concept and a program for implementing those changes, a program that would help us in the shortest possible time to extricate the republic from its grave situation, really involve it in the country's creative, restructuring rhythm, and focus the masses' energy and creative potential on resolving the historic tasks of restructuring and renewal.

Today's economic situation requires a new approach toward solving the tasks facing the republic, toward overcoming the negative trends that are emergig in a number of spheres of the national economy, toward elaborating priorities, and toward implementing targeted

programs for socioeconomic development and for raising the sectors determining scientific and technical progress to the level of contemporary world standards. The consistent implementation of a strong social policy is an extremely crucial matter for us now. After all, urgent, vitally important questions on which people's social mood and well-being depend were not resolved for many years.

In terms of a number of social development indicators, Armenia holds one of the lowest places among the union republics. For instance, per capita provision of housing, kindergartens, hospital beds, polyclinics, trade and communications facilities, and cultural institutions in our republic is below the USSR average. Many families, especially in Yerevan, are still living in decrepit, tumbledown buildings and in basements. We are marking time in food production. A high percentage of the able-bodied population is not employed in social production. The problems of water and the ecological situation remain serious.

The most important thing, workers told me at one of the meetings before the conference, is to create a healthy, moral atmosphere in the republic. This is indeed the most important thing for us now. If there is such an atmosphere, things will get moving. We are beginning with this. And it is perfectly clear to us that the great amount of complex work that lies ahead can be successfully performed only if all labor collectives, the entire working class, the kolkhoz peasantry, young people, and all strata of society take part. We attach special importance to stepping up the role of the intelligentsia, overcoming its isolation from party committees, eliminating the serious blunders committed in work with it, and making fuller use of its creative potential.

Comrades, our time is laying bare a multitude of complex problems in the sphere of national relations which, to be blunt, had long existed but to which we used to turn a blind eye, so to speak. The problem of Nagorno-Karabakh is one of them. The situation prevailing in Armenia and Azerbaijan has become acute. Serious damage has been caused to the traditional friendly, good-neighborly relations between the two peoples, which we greatly prize. A conflict in interethnic relations has arisen in a number of rayons. I will be frank: We have not yet been able to normalize the situation in the republic. It continues to remain tense.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, appealed to the working people and peoples of Armenia and Azerbaijan at a difficult period for us. This appeal was timely, comrades. It was of tremendous assistance to our republic's party organizations.

The origins of the present situation lie in a complex mesh of historical, social, economic, cultural, and ethnic problems and in the distortions of nationalities policy that took place during the period of the personality cult and stagnation. It is blasphemous to claim that restructuring, democratization, and glasnost were the causes of these events. The painful problems, I want to reiterate, did not arise only today or yesterday. They accumulated gradually, over the decades, without receiving the necessary solution nor even public [glasnyy] recognition. It is precisely the antidemocratic practice of hushing things up and showing indifference, the desire to brush aside the acute and complex problems that really exist, and attempts to drive them underground or to resolve them by authoritarian methods that led to such an explosive manifestation of them today. And it is precisely restructuring and the democratization and glasnost organically associated with it that have revealed the neglect of these problems. It is restructuring alone that at the same time creates the conditions and prerequisites for open discussion of them.

We know that attempts are sometimes made to ascribe the events in Nagorno-Karabakh and the sharp reaction to them on the part of our republic's working people solely to the actions of out-of-control extremist groups. This is, how shall I put it, an extremely simplistic idea. And it is scarcely possible to defuse the present situation by relying on this notion. I have to say, comrades, that such explanations are a painful blow to the national feelings of our republic's Communists and working people, and they also simply run counter to common sense.

The problems arising in interethnic relations, as the Central Committee Theses say, must be resolved on a genuinely democratic basis, within the mainstream of restructuring. In our view, the Nagorno-Karabakh problem, too, ought to be examined from this standpoint. An urgent need today is to elaborate new political thinking on the nationalities question. I will not be revealing any secret if I say that this question is one that has been neglected in our country. But in a sphere of human relations like national relations, no serious problem can be solved without renouncing obsolete approaches and stereotypes.

What lesson can be learned from the events in and surrounding Nagorno-Karabakh? Above all, it is that questions of the development of interethnic relations at both the all-union and the regional, republican, and local levels must be constantly kept at the focus of attention. It is important to investigate emerging and exacerbating problems in a timely fashion and to solve them in a considered and Leninist way, without relying on laissez-faire or reducing matters to a state of crisis.

Indeed, if the former leadership of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee and Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, seeing the direction in which events were developing, had taken the necessary joint steps in a timely fashion, from a Leninist, internationalist standpoint, then the situation in the region

would not have become so strained. We are now conducting joint work with the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, as Comrade Vezirov has mentioned, and coordinating our actions. We must continue to pursue this line.

The experience of the last few months convinces us that in conditions of democratization and glasnost, which substantially change the situation, party, soviet, and ideological cadres must know how to act in acute, nonstandard, and sometimes conflict situations and must know how to conduct a blunt polemic. Unfortunately, many of our cadres proved bankrupt in this extreme situation or simply lost their heads.

Life shows that interethnic problems can arise in relations between republics. We are clearly aware that it is impermissible to artificially provoke such issues and we realize clearly that, in Lenin's words, haste and administration by decree are particularly intolerable in resolving them. At the same time it is obvious that when such problems have already arisen, and on a real basis, it would be incorrect to avoid examining them. And we need to have a clear-cut, well thought-out mechanism for resolving them on a democratic, constitutional basis.

As the report says, within the framework of the existing structure of the union state it is necessary to take the interests of each nation and ethnic group and of the entire community of Soviet peoples into consideration as far as possible. But this, it seems to us, does not rule out the possibility of further qualitative improvement of this structure so that it takes more account of the growing, developing requirements of each nation and ethnic group and provides a full guarantee of their international and national self-expression.

We greeted with great satisfaction the idea expressed in the report that the reform of the political system envisages institutions that will make a profound and thorough examination of problems of interethnic relations. All the existing institutions of the political system which are supposed to reveal and coordinate nationalities questions need to be activated. In this connection the conference has quite rightly raised the question of the activity of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities, which is called upon to take the most direct part in formulating nationalities policy and putting it into practice and in monitoring the correctness of its implementation in the republics and at local level.

The following question also arises. As is well known, the present USSR Constitution was elaborated during the period of stagnation and unrealistic approaches toward assessing the state and development prospects of Soviet society. And this, as our press has now rightly noted, left a negative imprint on many of its provisions and articles. During the past period a new edition of the CPSU Program has been adopted and a fundamentally new strategic course and the theory and policy of the revolutionary restructuring of all aspects of Soviet society's life have been formulated.

In these conditions, in our opinion, it would be correct and timely for the party conference to recommend that the preparation of a new edition of the USSR Constitution be begun. This would fully accord with the party's course of completing the formation of a socialist law-based state.

Comrades! A little over 3 years have passed since that historic April, but we know how sharply the situation in the country has changed, people have begun to breathe more easily, and they have begun to feel that they are the masters of the country. The Soviet Union's prestige in the international arena has also increased. All this is the result of the truly innovative activity of the CPSU Central Committee and its Politburo. And it is up to you and me, comrades, to ensure that our time goes down in history as a really revolutionary stage of the renewal of Soviet society.

Armenia's Communists and people see it as their lofty duty to prove equal to the historic tasks that the party has put forward at the present crucial and very responsible period in our motherland's development. (applause)

Sokolov Defends Restructuring

LD2906164388 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 29 Jun 88

[Unidentified special correspondent's report from the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses]

[Excerpt] This is a report on the evening session. It was opened 1 hour ago, chaired by delegate Comrade Nikonov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the party Central Committee. He invited delegate Arutyunyan, first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee to speak. [passage omitted]

Speaking after him, Yefrem Yevseyevich Sokolov, first secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee, objected to those who consider that the achievements of restructuring are barely noticeable. Listen to the recording:

[Begin Sokolov recording] Let us be frank. Every one of us who mounts this platform can present so many problems that we all cannot solve them even by the end of the century, whereas it is necessary to feed people today, to give them housing today, and to supply them with goods also today. I will start with the economy.

People can be heard saying that stagnation in the economy is not being reduced, but on the contrary, is being deepened. In other words, we are allegedly moving backward. I want to object resolutely to supporters of such opinions.

Here are just some data from our republic. In 2 years, the gross national product has grown by 11.1 percent, and this is the real wealth of the country. National income grew by 11.5 percent, the average annual growth of the volume of industrial production constituted 6.9 percent, labor productivity 6.4 percent. In addition, the average annual production of grain increased by 31 percent, the production of cattle and poultry by 19, milk by 13 percent. For each R1 of the wages fund consumer goods worth R2.10 are made in the republic, including that in nonspecialized enterprises worth 70 kopeks. Approximately 20,000 families above plan have been given apartments. Don't these figures show that there is movement, and that this movement is not backward? We reckon that the acceleration has made itself apparent, but neither its speed nor its scale satisfy us. Your good words addressed to the Republic, Mikhail Sergeyevich, we receive as an advance.

The analysis of the work in new conditions shows that from the next year, from the next 5-year plan the Republic as a whole can transfer to full financial autonomy and self-financing. [end recording]

Just like the majority of speakers, Comrade Sokolov also referred to problems of the forthcoming reform of the political system in our country. Here is his view:

[Begin Sokolov recording] The delegation of the Belorussian Communist Party taking part in the work of the present party conference not only does not share but considers deeply mistaken the statements of Academician Abalkin to the effect that under a one-party system and under the soviet organization of society its democratization can hardly be ensured. We are convinced that the implementation of provisions put forward in the report about the perfection of democracy in the party, the formation of elective party organs, demarcation of their functions by soviets of people's deputies and by economy organizations, and the strengthening of party ranks will increase further the role of the CPSU as the leading and organizational force in Soviet society. [end recording]

As you can see, pluralism in opinion dominates the conference. The most varied and even opposing viewpoints are indeed being expressed. Judging by the reaction in the hall, not all delegates agreed with the view on the development of glasnost and the role of the press in this process, that is, the view expressed by writer Yuriy Bondarev. He also spoke at the evening session.

On this, we end our reportage from the Kremlin Palace of Congresses.

Sokolov Address Published

PM0107140988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jul 88 Second Edition p 3

[Speech by Ye.Ye. Sokolov, first secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee, at 29 June evening session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference: "Speech by Comrade Ye.Ye. Sokolov"]

[Text] Comrades, I want to briefly describe the general thrust of the report delivered by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. It is an assertion of Leninist ideals of socialism and the fullest revelation of its creative might and humanist nature. It imparts to the Land of the Soviets the aspect of a society of the future toward which the working people of the entire world turn their hopeful gaze. The very businesslike, constructive tone of the report gives grounds for disagreeing with the author of a note which reached the presidium yesterday concerning the fact that speeches from the localities must be somehow special in character [o tom, chto vystupleniya s mest dolzhny nosit kakoy-to osobyy kharakter].

I think that we have assembled here to work out, after sharing our grains of experience, the forms and methods of action which will make it possible to speed up restructuring in all areas of our multifaceted life. And how is it possible when summing up the results to pass over in silence what we have managed to do and what we have not? Where is restructuring gathering momentum, where is it marking time, and why? Let us be frank, everyone of us on mounting this rostrum could raise so many problems that we would not be able to solve them this century, but meanwhile it is also necessary to feed people today, to house people today, and provide them with goods today.

I will begin with the economy. Some people are saying that stagnation in the economy has not only not diminished but is, on the contrary, deepening. I want to resolutely object to the advocates of such opinions. Here are just a few figures for our republic. In 2 years gross social product has risen 11.1 percent—and this is the real wealth of the country. National income rose 11.5 percent, and the average increase in industrial output was 6.9 percent and in labor productivity, 6.4 percent. Average annual grain output increased 31 percent; livestock and poultry, 19 percent; and milk, 13 percent. The republic produces 2.10 rubles' worth of consumer goods for each ruble in the wages fund, including 70 kopeks' worth from nonspecialized enterprises; apartments have been commissioned in excess of the plan, and around 20,000 families have moved into new homes. These figures surely indicate that there is movement, and it is not retrograde movement. We consider that there has been acceleration, but neither its speed nor scale satisfies us, and we take your kind words regarding our republic, Mikhail Sergeyevich, as credit in advance. We primarily associate the reserves for improving matters with more specific work by our cadres in carrying out the radical

economic reform. This experience has been built up in the republic since the beginning of the 5-year plan, and since this current year, virtually our entire industry, the whole of the agroindustrial complex, transport, communications, consumer services, trade, and most construction organizations have been operating under conditions of full economic accountability and self-financing. It is already clear now that the independence of labor collectives and their interest in utilizing reserves and improving qualitative indicators have increased.

The trend toward a certain increase in the rates of economic and social development is also the result of the all-around cooperation of all fraternal republics. And we support the conclusion in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report about the need to strengthen and develop friendship with all the peoples of our multinational motherland. Analysis of work under the new conditions shows that the republic will be able to go over completely to full economic accountability and self-financing from next year and the next 5-year plan. This will make it possible to increase labor collectives' independence still further and develop their initiative.

Comrades, today, when progress in the national economy is impossible without a close link with science, we are expanding our search for ways to increase the yield from science and strengthen ties with production. It is, however, impossible to achieve a sharp improvement without changing our attitudes to the appropriations made to develop it. Last year, for example, the share of expenditure on science serving the republic's national economy amounted to only 0.53 percent of gross social product. This is 3-4 times lower than in Britain, Sweden, Japan, and the United States. It is scarcely possible with such an approach to substantially enhance the technical standard and quality of output, to speed up the development of technology which would make possible a fundamental increase in labor productivity, and to reduce outlay on materials and manpower.

The agro-industrial complex' scientific subunits are standing aside from producing highly efficient technology for the processing industry. The technology employed in the mixed-feed industry is 30 years old. Moreover, 2 million tonnes of grain forage annually fails to be processed in the republic even to this day. What sort of rate and amount of grain production are needed to make up for this improvidence?

The following question also worries us. At first glance, it seems a purely economic one. The mass media are continuing to conduct discussion as to whether land reclamation is necessary or not. And the bulk of those who take part in it live in beautiful apartments in the prestigious cities of our country. They do not experience the hardships and adversities which the peasants living in those swampy localities have encountered and continue to encounter to this day. In the opinion of our republic's working people, opposition to land reclamation is not only mistaken but harmful.

First, it is nothing more than a demand to preserve the swamp and thereby maintain difficult working and living conditions for thousands and thousands of people. Second, it is an attempt to slow down somewhat the solution of the food problem.

We are certain that we should fight not against land reclamation as such but in favor of new techniques for carrying it out, for the creation of new machinery and equipment making it possible to improve the quality of work, and for comprehensive exploitation of reclaimed land. And we, therefore, consider it unjustified to cut appropriations for land-reclamation construction.

Comrades, in an atmosphere of democracy and glasnost, real pluralism of opinions, the open clash of ideas and feelings people's social activeness is sometimes expressed in a tempestuous and unexpected way. Demagoguery quite often tries to hitch a ride on this surge toward democracy. How is one to separate genuinely democratic processes from demagogic deviations and excesses? How is one to learn to conduct not a monologue, one quite often expressed in the tones of a command or edict, but a dialogue based on convincing arguments and checked facts? How is one to raise the standard of all ideological and political work, which presupposes a high degree of trust in reason and everyone's feelings?

You will agree that these questions are not easy either. And you will scarcely find a party organization today which will firmly state that it has found the answers to these questions. Communists of older generation remember the once very popular slogan "Raising the New Man," but this simply failed to be achieved at all in either the period of the cult of the personality or the years of stagnation. Restructuring has no such slogan, and restructuring does not need it, because it is changing Soviet people's mentality and actions without any slogans. Their moral and social potential aroused by the ideas of restructuring are daily gathering momentum and demand appropriate action from party organizations.

The leader of a Belorussian plant recently asked me: "What is the difference, in your opinion, between me, the director of an enterprise, and the secretary of a party committee?" And then answered it himself: "I come to the shop and can say to a lathe operator, milling machine operator, or fitter, do as I do, and show them there and then. Whereas a party secretary might say: 'Do as I say.'" The plant director had engaged in a conflict with the party committee secretary and was trying to reproach him with ignorance of the basics of lathe and milling work.

There is no doubt that it is important for a party worker to master a particular skill. But that is far from being paramount. I am convinced that the formula "Do as I Do" is of permanent value for a party worker of any rank in his most important and most sacred task, the observing of Leninist norms and principles of party life. No one

disputes that there are still bureaucrats, suppressors of criticism, and people afflicted with communist arrogance and careerism amongst us. And yet it is the party leadership that has spoken of this for all to hear; it is the party itself that has waged an uncompromising struggle against degenerates, against those who pursue self-serving goals while working in the party apparatus.

However, some, having exploited this, would like to set party cadres and party organizations—and this is the foundation of the party—against the broad masses of the working people. Working people say: Their efforts are in vain, no one has ever managed to do this or will ever manage to. (Applause).

Discussion concerning the CPSU Central Committee Theses—and in our republic it proceeded with a high level of activeness on the part of Communists and nonparty people—convincingly showed that our people believe in the party and its collective reason and regard it as the sole force capable of leading the working class, the peasantry, the intelligentsia, and every stratum of the population on the path of restructuring, on the path of the free and all-around development of man.

The Communist Party's strength also derives from the fact that in following Lenin's behests, always being alongside the people, and constantly strengthening its unity with the people, it expresses their aspirations and hopes. That is how it has been, is, and will be.

The Belorussian Communist Party delegation taking part in the work of this party conference does not share the doubt expressed in Academician Abalkin's speech regarding the possibility of ensuring democratization in a one-party system and a soviet-organized society.

We are convinced that the implementation of the report's provisions to improve democracy within the party, to form elected party organs, to demarcate their functions from soviets and economic organizations, and to strengthen the party ranks will enhance the CPSU's role as the leading and organizing force in Soviet society. (Applause).

Comrades, the party conference's work is being followed with enormous attention and great hope in every city, village, and labor collective in our republic. Today, now that we have understood the provisions and conclusions of the report, we must firmly say: The people's hopes have been justified. This concerns both our domestic concerns and international affairs. In the history of the party and the whole Soviet people, the 19th all-union party conference will be the generator that will for many years fill us with a high moral and spiritual charge and rouse us to scale new heights for the good of our socialist fatherland.

Thank you for your attention. (Applause).

Gorbachev Talks With Delegates 29 Jun

LD0107091388 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 30 Jun 88

[Text] Yesterday, after the evening session, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev met with conference delegates in the foyer of the Kremlin Palace of Congresses. Those who took part in the conversations touched on many of the topical problems under discussion at the conference, including issues of social justice. We present an excerpt from that conversation:

[Begin recording] [Gorbachev] They say a Communist can live on the apparat. But Bakatin was right when he said that they can't find officials because of the pay. Who will join them for R240 when he's been earning R500 or R700?

[Unidentified delegates] That's right! Right! Right!

[Gorbachev] Or, our party pay, if you take the average pay of a party official: The average, of all those who work in the party, is R216. The average wage for the country is R203. What is that, a discrepancy? No, comrades! I say to our comrades, you know, of course there's probably something there. If people are saying it, then there must be something in it. What? We've developed this system. Take a factory. It has its own catering. And now it has its service sphere as well. The orders are there. They're building kitchens, they've got boarding-houses, they've got a stadium. It's all their own, their own infrastructure. Well, are we going to demolish that?

[Delegates] No, no!

[Gorbachev] Take the Academy of Sciences. It's the same story. Take the writers—it's the same story everywhere. I think it's all there. If you take a clinic or a hospital where a service is being provided, no doubt-...[Gorbachev changes thought] True, at the factory it's difficult now to compete with the big factories. There, everything's first-class—there they have everything of the best. But all the same, evidently there is, with the norms, with supply, with distribution... That's where. With equipment. Here there probebly are things that are going wrong. And they must be put right. They must be put right.

Well, or so they say, they've got their own party sanatoria. Well, listen, let's look at this: Our trade unions have 2.5 million sanatorium and vacation hotel places. The party has 8,500 places in sanatoria and vacation hotels... the party, throughout the country. Of those, 46 percent of the vacationers are workers, kolkhoz members, academics, party veterans, and so on. They say there are hospitals somewhere.

They say there are categories. Categories. Let us check them out. Because indeed, I once worked in the kray: There are no dachas in Stavropol Kray. Some sort of special... there's nothing there. There are no special

stores of any kind there. There are canteens everywhere; you have to have a canteen. On a construction site, there has to be a canteen—where there's a facility being built. So why shouldn't there be one in an organization? So there must be something else here; it needs to be sorted out, what the trouble is.

Vehicles. We've been asked to look into this: How many personal cars are there now? In the whole country, there are 850 party cars—850 for the whole country.

[Delegate] But they're for work, those cars—it's all talk.

[Gorbachev] And the cars in the raykoms and gorkoms, for every 7 or 10 officials, there's one car for travelling about, and so on. In other words, something has given rise to this as well, you understand. I don't think that's the point. The fact that we've turned out to have these sanctuaries, that most of it has gone to, they're also people, also living together, with everyone, and disentangle it all, as they say. [sentence as heard] And they're having a good time and living off the fat of the land. Therefore, this is something that hs to be clearly sorted out, in such a way that, you know...the party has, of course, taken everything on itself. Because indeed, it must answer to the people—answer. It is responsible, and we must not evade this. All this that has happened, we have accepted.

At the January plenum, we said: The party's guilty. Even so, we don't hound the party, the rank and file. Why am I so much against the fact that...ballast is ballast.

This attempt, you know, is aimed at the rank and file and ordinary Communists. What is ballast? Now that we have started developing intraparty democracy and democracy in the country, this ballast is found to be reducing fast. People have started joining in. Ballast begins to form when a person has no opportunities, when he is swaddled, you see, and he cannot show his initiative and assert his position. But as we get it moving, let us see now how the party will live and develop and what it will produce and how things will go.

Perhaps, there is a section of people that has dropped out, and it is probably difficult to return them to active life in the party. But that is another matter. The party question should, therefore, be discussed honestly and strongly. Let us do it this way: Having chosen our position, let us not avoid our responsibility. Let us also not evade being accountable directly to the people, but let us talk directly to the country, and so on.

It is not only in the party, among leading officials, but also in labor collectives that the situation is such: Leveling out has corrupted people and (?put them out of action.) If one employer pays R12 for a job, he will work for him, if another pays R20 for a job, he will work for that one. Still another pays R25 to his neighbor for a job, so he will now go and work for that one. The entire country must now be overhauled, and financial autonomy will find its way, in my view, although with difficulty, perhaps.

You are now being criticized. Comrades, we do not know a great deal. Life must teach us. And look now, things are beginning to take shape. If we wait till things are actually ready and the way is made clear, we will be at a standstill.

It is necessary to make attempts. Look, what a discussion we are holding. It will be all right. It will be all right. We are always in the thick of things here. [laughter from crowd]

We are told that in Yaroslavl, there's a works employing 48,000, and the workers said that they do not accept what some want to impose on them. We were initially shocked, generally speaking, and then said to them: Go and sort it out. They sat down: The director and all of them sat down and held a conference and discussions for 2 days. Finally, they gave their support to the director. What was it all about? About 15 Saturdays. The question was about 15. Why? The reply was: because we have not carried out the measures that we have planned regarding mechanization. Since productivity is not high enough, it is necessary to extend the working hours. So this gave courage to those who had failed to fulfill or ensure the solution of this problem... solved specific tasks. So they supported their director and decided to work on 15 Saturdays, as their director suggested. But let us ask them to give an account of themselves in a year.

This is the proper way to hold a discussion. What is wrong in that? Is it the workers who fail to pose things correctly? No, no, comrades, they are right. We must train everyone. Are there any questions? So, let us get together, and let us tackle this.

[Unidentified speaker] Go and relax, comrades. [end recording]

Gorbachev 29 Jun Walkabout Described

LD0107152388 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 30 Jun 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] As we have already reported, on 29 June the delegates to the party conference were invited to a festive concert. After it ended Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, together with other delegates, came out into the foyer of the Palace of Congresses. [video shows Gorbachev entering foyer followed by Ligachev and Ryzhkov who stand next to him during his conversations; Gorbachev approaches a group of delegates]

[Begin recording] [Passage omitted] [Gorbachev] What mood are you in? What is your opinion of our conference? The working class takes all the load on itself. All these politicians and scientists engage in discussions. It is

necessary to seek and discuss and so on. But at the same time the county is being supported by the working class and the peasantry. The country goes on living; and it is not simply going on living, but they have halted that crisis, and more than that too. That is why I never agree with [words indistinct]. There is so much that is new but still the worker has [words indistinct]. He sometimes loses pay but he remains staunch. If this was not the case, nothing would come of it.

[Unidentified male delegate] Today the working class understands the task. Let us start from the plant level. People understand. But at the top they do not understand. We are all workers here and they know I am right to say that we do not have the power today without support from the party organization, at least today in the first place it is the party organization which should help.

[Gorbachev] But, all the same, everything that we have put in motion—via reforms, via democracy, via the soviets, via the works collectives, via all of these things (?for involving people)—this is the only means, this is necessary. Then you will naturally hold power. Because what has gone wrong is that the revolution was begun in order to give back to man political power in the political process, so that the machine tools and so on should be their property and their own personal concern, and the land and the peasant on the land. But later this process broke down. 'There was a system which led to the worker's being indifferent to the enterprise and the peasant was not given the land but tied to it. And finally, there was the soviet of the working people; but the voice of the working people could not be heard. That is they were given the land in this form, but not the real thing.

What a people we have now, in the sense of the level of education, in the sense of dedication and patriotism. We have a vast and rich country and we can all....

[Unidentified male, interrupting] [Words indistinct].

[Gorbachev] And so the most important thing is that you should feel that you are masters of the country. That is the most important thing. [video shows Gorbachev moving out of the building and then talking to delegates]

[Gorbachev] No progress will be made without the party, particularly in such a vast country. Everything must be understood and united. At the same time (?we want to decentralize) the economy, decentralize in the sense of the federation, an extension of rights. But there must be a force which cements and unites during all of these processes of development [word indistinct] and independence. [passage omitted] [end recording]

Party Conference Proceedings Enter Third Day

30 Jun Speakers Listed

LD3006135888 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1200 GMT 30 Jun 88

[From the "Diary of the 19th Party Conference" program]

[Text] The daytime session was conducted by Comrade Shcherbitskiy, who offered the floor to Comrade Razumovskiy for report on behalf of the Auditing Commission.

Taking part in the debates then were (Abdulla Zakiryanovich Ramazanov), metallurgist of the Karaganda metallurgic Combine; Vitaliy Alekseyevich Korotich, chief editor of the OGONECK magazine; Vladimir Ivanovich Saranskikh, first secretary of Cherepovets Gorkom; Lyubov Petrovna Zhivetyeva, livestock expert from Farm No 4 of the "60-Letiye SSSR" Pervomayskiy stud farm in Tattarskiy Rayon of Novosibirsk Oblast; Rafik Nishanovich Nishanov, first secretary of the Uzbekistan Communist Party Central Committee; and Ivan Dmitriyevich Laptev, chief editor of IZVESTIYA. The 19th All-Union CPSU Conference continues its work. [video shows all named speakers, as well as the presidium, where Gorbachev is to the left of Shcherbitskiy on the screen; behind them are (?Demichev), Biryukova, and Dobrynin. When Razumovskiy speaks, Ryzhkov and Solomentsev can be seen behind him; behind Solomentsev is Kapitonov]

Postnikov, Gorbachev Exchanges

PM0107100888 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jul 88 Second Edition pp 5-6

[Speech by V.I. Postnikov, general director of the "Stavropolskoye" Broiler Production Association, at 30 June morning session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference]

[Text] Esteemed comrades! Before my speech, the conference presidium has instructed me to read out a note from Tamara Vasilyevna Gracheva—delegate from the Moscow City party organization. She writes: "We are tackling the Food Program, yet we are not allowing those who bitterly voice their ideas and proposals on this question to speak out. We all want to eat, but we don't want to listen. We must respect one another." (Applause.)

But I, like Gracheva too, I suppose, as an agricultural worker, would also like to hear constructive proposals from science about the ways, means, and methods of resolving the food problem, which Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev described in his report as most acute. People naturally expect from us, in the process of restructuring, first and foremost the resolution of the Food Program, that is, an improvement in supplies to the population.

Delegates have already said that we have yet to hear anything from the scientists apart from theoretical generalizations and distrust in restructuring. Clearly it is no accident that in our country everything that has emerged recently, all the new phenomena in agriculture—the lease contract, the formation of firms, associations, and combines, the democratization of management—have their origins in practical work and are formulated, are economically substantiated, if I may put it that way, by specialists with a salary of R140, while science scarcely plays a part.

Unfortunately we obtain more information about the most complex social phenomena in the labor collectives from the periodical press and from journalism. For instance, we have been working on the basis of economic accountability for a long time. Our people have good wages and the social conditions are not bad. But all the same it must be said frankly that people work sluggishly, are satisfied with too little, and are more interested in grabbing than in earning. The answer to the question of why this happens was given, in my view, by the well known journalist Comrade Vasilyev—he is sitting on our presidium here—in his article "New Interest" in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, where he demonstrated simply, perspicaciously, convincingly, and scrupulously that as long as the working person is cut off from the land, until such time as he is the coproprietor of the enterprise and participates actively in management, he will do perfunctory work. And that means that the Law on the Cooperative System that has been adopted and the lease contract should lead us out of the impasse. I believe that this is a central social issue, to which our conference's attention should be directed. (Applause.)

Therefore, I submit this proposal: to extend the Law on the Cooperative System to all agricultural enterprises and all associations, that is, to create absolutely identical conditions for competitive work, because the Law on the State Enterprise (Association), which we are guided by and which was adopted earlier, has proved to be flawed: It contains very little that is intelligible and very few guarantees for the socialist enterprise, and what it says about democratic management is patently inadequate. Therefore, I think there is a need to supplement it with the propositions that are present in the Law on the Cooperative System in Agriculture.

And something else about the cooperative system. Our people go abroad very often. I recently returned from the Netherlands, for instance. That is a highly developed country. And when we asked, how did you manage, on these polders, on bad land, to become the biggest exporters of agricultural produce in Europe, they answered, smiling, that your ideas on cooperatives, the ideas that originated in your country, we were the first to put them into practice, and you are still busy talking.

I must say that the farmer in the Netherlands is a very prestigious figure. The state also creates certain conditions for him. I think our peasant too should be raised to a higher level, his prestige in our society should be enhanced. (Applause.)

Comrades! The management of agriculture. Yesterday Comrade Kabaidze said that if you go over to economic accountability, and he has done so, then their association does not need the ministry. Of course, that sounds challenging and not what we are used to. But I support this idea. (Applause.) And this is why I support it.

Our broiler association was set up in 1975. Even then, by way of an experiment, our kray leadership officially decided that nobody should interfere in the association's affairs: neither party, nor soviet, nor agricultural organs. All those years we did our own planning and controlled our own finances. In 13 years I have never had to give a report anywhere, I have never been summoned anywhere to report. I give my party word of honor and I answer for those words. And as you can see, our association has certainly not perished. It exists, and here I am sitting on the presidium. (Applause.)

In that time we have—I will give a couple of figures, nevertheless—increased meat production from 10,000 to 78,000 tonnes. We now have R44 million of profit. Like Kabaidze, we are not only reluctant, we consider it unworthy of us to turn to the bank for credit, for money. We ourselves can lend any enterprise money on certain terms.

And another thing. We have our own foreign trade ties, our own account at the Foreign Economic Bank. And we plan this year to make sales to the value of R4-5 million in foreign currency. That is not bad, for us.

An association [assotsiatsiya] has now been set up, consisting of the "Kuban" and "Ramenskoye" combines and our association [obyedineniye]. We believe that these enterprises will find it far easier to resolve every issue than each of them individually. We will invite other enterprises to join our association too.

The leadership of agriculture. We have such a concept, and the term has even taken root. But with the introduction of the cooperative system and the lease contract, any farming leadership in the old sense must disappear, because the new forms presuppose self-management. An appeal has been made repeatedly at the conference to hand over power to the soviets, and in this context the question arises: To whom should an enterprise be subordinate?

I think that irrespective of the transfer of greater power to the soviets, an enterprise should be self-governed by the people. Any democratization in our political system must begin with the enterprise. At present, for instance, the labor collective councils still do not feel very comfortable, their status is not yet firmly established, but this line must be taken to its conclusion. The people's power should begin with the enterprise, and then all the questions of democratization will be resolved. (Applause.)

Comrades, now for economic accountability. However much we may talk about it—and we are talking about it a great deal now—I personally believe that until fiscal reform is carried out, economic accountability will be illusory and incomplete and will not give our economic leaders the opportunity to recognize the charm of economic accountability and learn to do real, proprietorial work at the enterprises.

M.S. Gorbachev: Viktor Ivanovich! Are you talking about price reform, or fiscal reform?

V.I. Postnikov: Fiscal, wholesale, and retail—it should all go together, this reform should be carried out all at the same time.

M.S. Gorbachev: Pricing?

V.I. Postnikov: Yes, pricing too. I also realize that this is a very difficult question, unpopular with the people. And the newspapers are getting ahead of events, whipping up the situation, demanding that we do not carry out reforms, but postpone them until the 13th 5-Year Plan and later. I believe that for the sake of the cause, for the sake of our economy these measures must be taken by the end of this 5-year plan. The people will understand, if we work everything out well. Especially since nobody intends to injure the people through retail prices.

And another question. For a long time in our country the state has purchased raw materials from agriculture, rather than output. Because of that, there are enormous losses and very great indifference among farm leaders toward the storage and processing of output. In the Soviet Union only a few individual enterprises concern themselves with processing, the others try to palm off the sheep or cow onto a combine. And although we reckon meat in live weight, when you process it, you are left with only 50 percent of edible parts. Therefore I believe that in revising prices the state could encourage the processing of produce on the spot on every farm and work out a procedure whereby everyone has an interest in processing produce on the spot and selling it through own-brand stores.

We took up processing only 18 months ago, really took it up solidly. And although in that time we have begun to process only 30 percent of our produce, we are already receiving colossal economic benefits. We supply produce for the population in packaged form, and in that time we have increased output by 16 percent and received an additional R18 million in profit, not through increasing prices, but through making better use of raw materials. Eight own-brand stores have been opened in Stavropol. We are going to trade in Moscow too: This year we will be opening 4 stores, next year—10.

Unfortunately it must be said that in organizing sales and own-brand trade we have come up against an organization that could destroy us overnight. While meat is available, this organization could keep any city hungry, and nobody would know why. It deducts a percentage from the meat in its own favor which is almost equal to the profit we obtain in production. I am talking about the Ministry of Trade. It is an omnipotent organization.

Since 1983, when we set up economic accountability, I have experienced much. But now I find myself powerless to do anything with that department. They say we have no mafia. I tell you we do, we have a mafia. (Applause.) Not a Sicilian mafia, perhaps, there they shoot people, whereas here they go in for extortion and ruin the state, and it is very difficult to do anything about it. For instance, we have just agreed to deliver produce to Moscow. We cannot find a common language merely to finalize a document and decide what form the contract should take for the delivery of meat to Moscow, although that document was signed by two members of the Politburo.

Comrade Kazakov, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, sticks to his guns, holds his ground, he is in no mood for restructuring. And sometimes it becomes downright offensive—an organization like the RSFSR Ministry of Trade Meat and Dairy Products Trade Administration exists. It writes out checks, does nothing, but rakes in the money. Why do they exist, these idle organizations, in the period of restructuring, in our time? (Applause.)

You see, Comrade Ulyanov in his speech was looking for real live bureaucrats, I have mentioned a few. (Applause.)

Now, about bureaucracy in general. I align myself with those who speak of this phenomenon with grief and anxiety. This is the main enemy of restructuring now. And bureaucracy begins not only with the management apparatus in the higher echelons, it begins right from the farm apparatus, the association apparatus—and so on, right to the top. There are specific people, as Comrade Ulyanov said, and all this is well known. How could it come about that the state order has already been compromised, and nobody was called to account. After all, there are, in fact, people who should be held accountable, who deliberately ensured that the state order would lose its power from the very first day. (Applause.)

Mikhail Sergeyevich, restructuring is a revolution. You have said that we will try to carry it out calmly, by humane methods. But since it is a revolution, you cannot carry it out by those methods. (Applause.) Exhorting people and constantly educating the bureaucrats, for instance, is useless, we know that even here there are people who are against restructuring, and you can do nothing more with them, they must be thrown out, they must be expelled from the party. (Applause.) But you are a humane man by nature, we know you, and you want to educate them by humane methods. They should be stripped of their posts and quietly pensioned off.

M.S. Gorbachev: Viktor Ivanovich, let us have a talk in the presence of witnesses (laughter) on this subject. You have made Mikhail Sergeyevich look rather simple. I think if the Central Committee once again starts removing that bureaucrat who is over there in Stavropol Kray with you or even in your association, or perhaps a bit higher up, in the Russian Federation, or anywhere else, it will not work. We have seen all that before. We have tried to do much from above. Nothing comes of it. Today we are seeking through economic reform, through the reform of the political system and the normalization of the spiritual sphere, through the mass media, to set the whole of society in motion, and then the bureaucrat will have nowhere to go. The ground will slip away from under his feet. And that is really what he is afraid of. But he will always come to an agreement with the bosses. He will produce, as he has produced for 10 or 20 years in succession, two truckloads of arguments, so to speak, and in the end you will give in. Therefore it is not a question of being good and not a question of pleasing everyone. It is necessary to pursue a political line in the interests of the people, in the interests of socialism, involving the people themselves in all the processes. The people will soon put everything straight. If the mechanism that is being discussed at the conference today is adopted, that is what will happen. (Applause.)

V.I. Postnikov: You have changed my mind. And therefore I have finished my speech. (Laughter. Applause.)

Gorbachev Address 30 Jun

LD3006122788 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1102 GMT 30 Jun 88

[From the "Diary of the 19th Party Conference"]

[Text] Today is the third day of the work of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference. The delegates who have gathered in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses are continuing debates on the party's Central Committee report on the course of implementing the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the tasks of deepening restructuring.

The delegates are talking about the necessity of society's political reconstruction and about ways to tackle the most acute problems, including those of food and housing. They are calling bureaucratism and command style of leadership—the main enemy of restructuring.

The session was chaired by Ryzhkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. The conference rostrum was taken today by the following comrades:
—Postnikov, general director of the 'Stavropoliye' Broiler Association;
—Yarin, an operator from the Lenin Metallurgical Combine in Nizhniy Tagil;
—Logunov, member of the CPSU Central Committee and rector of Moscow State University;
—Melnikov, first secretary of the Komi Obkom;
—Patiashvili, member of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Communist Party of Georgia Central Committee; and
—Starodubtsev, chairman of the Novomskovskoye Agro-Industrial Association of Tula Oblast.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev was then given the floor:

[Begin Gorbachev recording] Comrades, all six commissions established to draw up the resolutions began their work yesterday in keeping with the decision of the conference. One of these commissions is headed by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and is to draw up two resolutions. The first is of a general political nature, according to the agenda; the second also concerns a key issue—about the reform of the political system and about the democratization of the party. And so, I would like to tell you why I took the floor during the conference proceedings.

Yesterday, at this commission, during the discussion of the draft of the resolution, an exchange of views developed; at first here and then later, after the evening session. It was an exchange on the question of dividing the functions of party and state bodies. This exchange was interesting and rich in content. We finished it on a wave of mutual understanding.

But comrades spoke quite concertedly, on the initiative of certain comrades from among the workers, and they were seconded then by the whole commission. They expressed a wish to convey the essence of the talk to the conference, because there is a question of a certain lack of understanding of the proposals related to this issue. Evidently, what was said within the framework of the report was not enough. This was understandable because the report covered an enormous range of problems concerning all the lines of restructuring. However, this can be explained, and, apparently, the issue should be clarified.

Here, comrades, one should bear in mind the initial point of our strategic line toward restructuring. Restructuring is being implemented in the interests of man, and man and the people should be the primary character of restructuring. Hence, the social orientation of the policy of restructuring addressed to man, aimed at overcoming everything that was negative in the preceding periods in order to improve man's general state, his dignity, and living conditions. Hence, it is staking on democratization in the broadest sense—in the economy, political sphere, and spiritual area—in order to provide real opportunities for engaging man in all the processes of restructuring, proceeding from the fact that he, and not the apparatus, is the main character of restructuring.

The people are being given all the importance of all the levels of our political system, and so on. We have unfolded the process of democratization in the spiritual sphere and created a social atmosphere in the country

that allows us—as we are doing at this conference—to discuss everything that worries us all and everything to which we should provide answers at this conference. We have engaged ourselves extensively in radical economic reform. Today it is tens of millions of people, the whole country, and tomorrow it will be the whole national economy amounting to hundreds of millions. Therefore, it is an enormous process and a deep one. To think that in such a vast country, with the number of problems which have accrued, that everything will happen in such a way that all will be all right when you wake up in the morning is an illusion and constitutes a naivete that one should rid oneself of, comrades.

We have an enormous job to do, a large-scale job. It will require revolutionary endurance. You know, he who endures, wins. However, there are those of us who are frightened by the process of democracy and the movement of public thinking underway in the country and panic. There are others who cry for help, which is no different. There are also those who say that nothing changes from one day to the next, that nothing has changed overnight, and that something, anything, must be done; they must drive people on, and so on.

No, comrades, that would be the simplest and shortest line, but it would be an erroneous one. We have an enormous job to do. We have unleashed the process; we have embarked on a radical economic reform, and next comes reform of the political system. We came to this reform, too, as a result of the development of our restructuring itself. It is the logic of restructuring that led us to the fact that now we must get down to reforming the political system. Why? Because this reform is simply vitally necessary to us.

I want to remind you—and there are those who remember those years, but those who are a bit younger should know it, for we have indeed in various periods since the war embarked on major sociopolitical initiatives throughout the country, comrades—you will remember the September plenum. Vasiliy Aleksandrovich [not further identified] was speaking just now and said everything correctly. I very much support him, as a man, as an innovator, as a very thinking person, a person dedicated to the cause, to the soil, a man who gives much that can be used as an example for others. But we're talking about the September plenum of 1953. What a great big jolt it created then. At the time I was working as a machine operator at a machine-tractor station, and I remember that the rebirth of the countryside was going on. But already by 1958 the whole thing had become bogged down; everything had broken down. You remember the March plenum. It was not simply a plenum on agrarian questions, on questions of agrarian policy. It was a plenum on how the country should be managed, how policy should be shaped, on what foundation—scientific or democratic—with the society's participation, how the party should operate, and how it should manage the economy. It was a plenum that overall contained such designs that if we had been transformed both in this sphere and in society as a whole, we would have gone confidently forward. Already the eighth 5-year period, under the influence of these attitudes—and it was the best of these last 5-year periods—foundered, as did the March plenum and the agrarian policy. The industrial reform started by the September plenum, I'm thinking of 1965, also foundered.

And what was the question about at that time, comrades? About the same thing that we are remembering today and using a great deal in the economic reform. What is the crux of the matter? Everything came up against the political system, against the command and order methods of governing society, and against all its spheres. I will tell you straight: If we do not reform the political system, all our initiatives, all our initiatives, all the huge, large-scale deeds which we began, will be hampered, will be hampered precisely here.

That is why here I do not agree with Leonid Ivanovich Abalkin, whose speech strongly reeks of economic determinism and, in general, of an underestimation of the superstructure which we have decided to reform. He spoke of the deputies, of how you are going to elect them, what the sessions will be like, and what you will say at political institutions. I think that the report was not about this, that, and the other. The point at issue is a very major reform. Incidentally, I think that the conference sees this, the people see it, and the whole world already sees it. It is a pity that Comrade Abalkin did not see it and that he spoke of this, that, and the other. [applause]

It is necessary to know economic laws, to study them, and to use them in activities. Socialism, Lenin said, is lively creativity of the masses. The masses can get involved when there are the prerequisites, through the mechanisms of democracy in all spheres—political, economic, and intellectual—to take part in all processes in the society. We have done a lot, I said, in the intellectual sphere. We have embarked on a radical economic reform and will press ahead with it at any cost and no matter how hardput we will be. We can see how acute economic issues are here, but we must understand: This cause will get bogged down if we do not reform the political system that is the starting point. [applause]

The reform, according to our designs, has been set forth. Incidentally, they are our designs; I do not think that they would be worth anything if they had been invented in the Politburo by a group of people behind closed doors. No! For 3 years we have been gathering ideas to properly approach the issue. That is exactly why we turned to our entire history to understand, to learn lessons. Why, after all, did it all happen like that? The country, having such vast potential at its disposal, could not... [Gorbachev changes thought] finds itself in a difficult situation today, in a precrisis condition. And we are not happy with the way the society, the economy,

etc., function. That analysis enabled us to draw certain conclusions, to amass certain knowledge for our discourse on today and tomorrow.

In the course of 3 years, we have gained our own experience in conducting affairs. We have gotten a lot of bumps on the head, but we get more intelligent day by day—not just year by year, but day by day. I can see at Central Committee plena how much our party Central Committee changes from one plenum to another. Life itself, the logic of restructuring, elevates us all, and, combined with glasnost and with the launch of pluralism in socialist opinions, people open up, society opens up, and ideas emerge. We are able to choose from among those ideas and, incidentally, to choose collectively again, and to discuss them and settle on something. So all that we have proposed is what we today have been able to propose as a party and as a society. This is ours and yours. So let us discuss very responsibly and seriously. The cornerstone is the revival of the soviets as full-blooded bodies of people's power, bodies which would be based on the new principles of a new electoral system and which would ensure the expression—the fuller expression—of our society's numerous interests. That's the first thing. Second, as a result of the reform, the soviets should obtain full power, full power in regions, rayons, towns, oblasts, republics, and so on. This should be backed up by the appropriate legislative bodies. Such a decision—a broadening of the rights of the soviets—should be backed up materially. This is referred to in the report. We believe that these decisions fell down because there was a strong tendency to ask: What must the soviet do? And it would end with a single line: Including coordinating the activity of all the organizations situated in this territory. It would also add the postscript: Within the bounds of their competence.

At a meeting with the secretaries prior to the preparation of the Theses, Comrade Filipp Vasiliyevich Popov, secretary of the Altay Kray, who addressed you yesterday, said: I worked for 7 years as chairman of the oblispolkom, and I can read it well. I cannot be silent; the soviet will now assume power; we can get down to work; and suddenly, at the end...within the bounds of its competence. Just start to look under the microscope for this competence. It isn't there. All this must be solved, comrades. We must bear in mind that you and I must now work out a political line. Our conference...we must start with this conference to provide an example of how a political vanguard should operate. We must not prescribe allocations of 10 percent to this and 20 percent to that for the benefit of the soviet. No.

This is a matter of specific study, with the participation of republics, krays, and oblasts. We must work out a direction and a political line and how, by sticking to it, to revive the power of the soviets. That is the task you and I face. But, of course, we will not get a policy without specifics; we need specific ideas and specific arguments, in order for them to crystallize, and then we will have our political directive. Of course, we must act so that the soviets, on the basis—and I hope this doesn't worry either Viktor Ivanovich Postnikov or others, who say they want the soviet to give orders to the labor collective—no, there must be mutual relations on a legal basis, with certain norms. These sort of relations must be arranged. A territory, as well as an enterprise, must have a respectful attitude toward the local authorities who are formed by the people who, after all, work in these same enterprises. The local authorities have an interest in the territory making progress and gaining strength. This living dialectic will have to be expressed later in our relevant legislative documents. And of course, economic questions must be resolved irrespective of whom this or that enterprise is subject to—an oblast, a republic, or the union.

In general, I think that the principle is clear to you. What we have to do here—I don't want to go into any greater depth—the principle is as stated, and we have to out a political directive and give a recommendation.

The next matter is very important, concerning the demarcation of the functions between the party and state bodies. Comrades, we have been dealing with this question since Lenin's times, in Lenin's time, and to the present day. But in Lenin's time, they dealt with this, and something was in the process of being attained. Then the well-known administrative-command system triumphed, and it led to the well-known deformations, because we overburdened the party with functions which were not intrinsic to it, and to a significant degree, drained the blood of the Soviets.

We lost out, as a result of the party being unable—because it was overburdened with all current matters—to deal with many most major political questions of development, socialism, our country, we lost out on this, we lost a great deal. Just look at how many blatant problems there are in the development of our socialism. After all, they demand an analysis, a theoretical analysis, the working out of an adequate policy, and then the working out of the mechanisms which would lead to the embodiment of this policy. We are now faced with creating all this. These mechanisms do not exist now. And, the delegate from Nizhniy Tagil spoke very directly, like a working man, that many questions have to be resolved. It's true that he called for—at least that's what I felt—Mikhail Sergeyevich, you have to bang your fist. Comrades, in general, it's possible [stirring in hall]. If that's what you agree to, then let's start banging. [applause]

Do you know what? As far as banging is concerned, and as far as the fist is concerned, then that has been pretty well perfected in our country. We can share it with anyone you like. As we set about resolving the tasks of renewing the party and society as a whole, we have to refrain from suddenly starting to resolve this using the old methods which we want to get away from, and which placed our society in this condition. [applause].

I will never agree with this, and this is what I stand on. And I tell you honestly and plainly: This is my firm position. If we do not involve the people in the processes, then no kind of apparatus—and we have one of some 18 million today, and spend R40 billion to maintain it every year in the country, and has it coped with administration? It has not. Because the system is wrong, as is the management of the economy, and the management of society as a whole. What is needed is what we are today discussing, and what we have been doing for 3 years in succession: We must go down this path; I am convinced that we are on the right road. [applause]

The next question concerns the division of functions between party and state bodies. If we really want to resolve this task and to revive the soviets, we must deal with it in a thorough manner—in a very thorough manner, indeed. But take a look at what ought to take place, and what we intend to do, and this is precisely what we ought to do later. Many issues are now being tackled in our country by the party committees, by industrial departments. We must preserve the party and revive it on truly Leninist principles as a political vanguard party which will provide us in a timely manner with solutions to all the most important questions of our country's life and its prospects for advancement. It must become engaged in establishing ideology, engaged in organizing the masses, and become closely connected with people, so that it may inspire support, and defend people where necessary. We need the party, which will expand a very wise and farsighted cadre policy in the interests of restructuring.

We need all this, comrades. After all, we live in a multinational country. If we do not take into account in our restructuring the interests of each republic and autonomy, restructuring will not work in our country. Restructuring will work in our country only if each people, each nation, each people, and each ethnic group feel they are full participants, when they feel that it is in our common interest, in the interest of each nation and each nationality. [applause]

This requires enormous intellectual, theoretical, and political work. Take a look at this: I have listened to many of our scientists. Some are making a very serious analysis and are helping us. But our constructive stock of ideas and conceptions is very weak. After all, you have heard it in the past 2 days! If we are at the stage of criticizing the analysis, then here still exist, so to speak, achievements and evaluations that deserve attention. What will come next? We ought to set the restructuring in motion. People want it to proceed faster. This is why the party has to powerfully unfold these processes, comrades. It has many problems at the moment—we have already said that it is necessary today to complete the work on and to finalize the needed agricultural policy, so that it will correspond to the present stage of restructuring and to society's needs. We said that the nationalities questions are knocking on our doors and windows. We have started to study them, and they require a separate plenum. We said that the problems of bringing up young people and training those who will replace need to be resolved.

All these questions are of enormous importance, questions of our country's fate, and they must be tackled. This is why it is necessary to free the party from uncharacteristic posts and to unleash powerful work in all these political directions, so the party [sentence unfinished as heard] And I can see no other force. All those who are attempting to put in doubt here the position and significance of the party—and some even want to perhaps argue here that, on the whole, it follows from the past that it is necessary to limit the party, and so on—no, this is not the point, comrades. This is not the point. Executive committees—a rayispolkom or an oblis polkom, I sat on those executive committees for many years, I was first secretary of the Stavropol Kray party committee for 9 years and a member of the executive committee, and before that, I was a secretary of the city party committee, so I know them inside out; I know what they are like. Sessions are scheduled by the executive committee. Why? The executive committee calls sessions. It determines their agendas as it likes, regardless of the region's needs or the importance of the issue, regardless of whether or not it is convenient. Today the executive committee decides.

And the whole apparatus is attached to the executive committee; executive directorates are attached to the executive committee. Where can a deputy report? To an executive organ. Today, comrade, the local soviets in their capacity as representative bodies find themselves playing second or third rate roles. The apparatus is giving orders or, at best, the executive committee. But, if we are to revive the local soviets, first and foremost, we have to revive a council, one that represents people, and give it the corresponding guarantees so its power becomes an immediate source of other plenary powers, so to speak. If you and I contracted the virus of distrust and doubt regarding our party's predestination, all the more since representatives of the whole party are sitting here, it would be the greatest present to those who oppose restructuring. [applause] The party must revive itself based on Leninist principles as a political vanguard; it must unfold its potential. Society waits for this as do all socialists and the progressive world, I am telling you. And I am sure that the CPSU, which has embarked on a bold analysis, has taken responsibility, and has opened itself to criticism, can cope with this. Everybody is now criticizing the CPSU, both in the country and in the world. Never mind, only a strong party, capable of enduring all this, realizing this, working out a policy, and leading a society, only such a party can be really called a political vanguard. I am sure that our party, the Leninist party, is like that, and I say with even greater conviction that it will be like that in the future. [applause]

Now local soviets are acquiring enormous executive power and enormous rights. I will tell you this is a

problem, too. What is the situation? Now our local soviets, as organs consisting of popular represenatives, are reduced to acting as assistants to these soviet's executive committees.

The soviet should be formed, as I have already said, on a different basis. Active people should come to it. Obviously, we do not need cumbersome, unwieldy soviets. We will have a think about this later. At this time, it is important to determine approaches, and whether this soviet ought to form the executive committee—ought, via commissions and after preliminary discussion, to select managers of directorates. Moreover, in this regard, there is nothing to do in the soviet for those who manage directorates within the executive committee. Let them move over to the executive committee and work toward executing all decisions of the soviets. At the moment, you see, in our country all the executives are also deputies, members of a soviet. They determine for themselves what they have to do. And who will check on them? Therefore, comrades, the turnabout is altogether a sharp one.

Don't think that everybody will applaud what we are undertaking, but if we want this, to regenerate the soviets, then it is necessary to take this road. Apart from perhaps just the chairman of the executive committee, all the remaining members of the executive committee should not be deputies. It is a cabinet which appoints a soviet for itself, an executive one, and let it act and answer for its actions. In order that the soviet should set to work, it is necessary that it should have a body which would give meaning to this work and, so to speak, generate ideas and latch on to processes that are taking place, so that it should maintain a control over the executive bodies, including the executive committee.

However, in connection with this, it is also proposed that it is necessary to reinforce... [Gorbachev changes thought] I'll put it bluntly: We have discussed this task. We've got nothing to be shy about either before the party or inside the party, before the people, or before the world. We are a ruling party, and in any country, it is the ruling party which forms the government on all levels, the executive and regional authorities. Some parties arrive there through revolutionary processes, by peaceful or nonpeaceful ways; others arrive through, so to speak, election campaigns. But it is the party currently in power that forms and advances all cadres, so to speak, through democratic mechanisms, through relevant voting, and so on. It is this power that submits these proposals. Such is our party's position, and we do not renounce this role of the ruling party in the country. No, on the contrary, we wish to reaffirm it. We sense our increased responsibility on the stage of restructuring.

And if this is so, then probably we are talking about such a turnabout when soviets ought...when the executive power of soviets will be strong, and as a representative body it is necessary to increase its authority. Then in this case, we have come up with such a view—and incidentally, it was suggested from below, in one or two letters from below, from old Communists. Afterward, we started to discuss this idea among ourselves. We then took it to a broader forum and started to discuss it with jurists. Then on three (?occasions) I met with obkom secretaries at the Central Committee. I will not speak of this right now, however, because this is also extra work, so to speak, and not everything can be done at once, so to speak. However, when we began to reflect—combined with the fact that the party should be revived as a political vanguard, and shed functions that do not belong to ti, and pass over to the soviets resolution of these issues, and that it is necessary to back up a representative body—it then becomes clear that we must proceed along this path and back up this restructuring of the soviets with the party's authority. If we leave it like it is, then I am convinced that the tradition is now such, the strength of it is such, that that is how everything will remain—in the bureau of the party committee. We must back up the influence and authority of the soviets in order to develop their potential. That is why, in these soviets, the chairmen of the soviets must be elected.

The presidium will be elected by the chairmen of the standing committees of that soviet, and they will organize the work, but this presidium will not have—not directly, not immediately—control functions with regard to the executive committee. No, only the soviet will have them, through sessions and by examining issues and handing down decisions, and not by such a presidium starting to instruct the executive committee. This is not necessary, either. Once we begin giving immense responsibility to the executive committee for the execution of duties, it too will have, so to speak, to be unhampered and not interfered with. But then we shall have to delegate things in a precise way. I think this is right. People say: Let the secretary remain in the executive committee. You know, then a secretary becomes an executive, and what will he be? One who puts forward political decisions made at a session. But who will be supervising? It is a confused situation at the moment. Can you work it out, comrades? [stirring in the hall] He who decides, carries out, but who makes the demands? That is why many people are saying: This has been adopted, but it is still lying on the table; that has been adopted, and it is still there. That, comrades, is why I have gone a little beyond the bounds of this debate on the theses presented in the report. That is why no ideas can be dragged quietly and secretly through, leaning on the support of the authority of the conference. No, comrades, we must proceed openly, with a realization of the immense cause we are undertaking. We must lean on the authority of the party, and elevate and revive the soviets. If we allow these two key forces in our political system to collide, we will have nothing, but nothing, comrades. Such a process is a dialectical, organic one, however. Now, you know what a good thing it is that, according to the new requirements that—I hope—you

and I will be setting, our secretaries at all levels now will be elected by secret vote at plenums from two, three, or whatever number of candidates.

This means that a candidate has been checked once, in a democratic way. He subsequently is recommended. After all, the party committee now decides on numerous matters without having been given the right by the people of the area, by all working people. But in the future, via the soviets, via the representatives of the working people, he will go through yet another campaign, so to speak. He will be discussed and then may face another vote. We say, then, it is not a hard and fast rule: It may mean that they are not always accepted. Someone else may also be put forward. But, then, a question arises: If that does not happen? Then let the party committee look into it. But who heads the party committee?

You know, at present, it is not as if secretaries are enthusiastic; they will now stop to think about these kinds of things. It means, in the first place, additional responsibilities and, in the second place, the party coming under the working peoples' control. It is as if the party were going through democratic verification procedures. But it is necessary to tackle matters with the support of the people's will.

Well, I can already see that the Moscow secretaries are dissatisfied, shaking their heads as if, in all probability, to say: That's going too far. But that, comrades, is the only way. I think there is no contradiction here, no contradiction if we think: Well, let us do it this way. Let's forget what our functions are at present; let us, for the duration of the conference, forget our functions and begin, in a comradely way and in the spirit of party comradeship, to ponder how to make everything in our political system function. If however, we are to be obsessed all the time with the thought: Where will that leave me? Or is this to my advantage or disadvantage? Then we will not come out of this situation, I can tell you.

We have made an attempt to look at this entire process and have involved the whole party and the people in an open and democratic way. I think we are making correct proposals. Well, I was instructed by the commission to say a few words, but this is not yet a conclusion, comrades. [applause] [end recording]

PRAVDA Publishes Speech

PM0107124188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jul 88 Second Edition p 8

[Speech by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at 30 June morning session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference]

[Text] Comrades! Yesterday in accordance with the conference decision all six commissions created to draw up resolutions started work.

One of these commissions is headed by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. It is to prepare two resolutions. The first will be of a general political nature on the conference agenda, and the second will be on the democratization of society and the reform of the political system.

Why have I taken the floor during the conference? Yesterday at a session of this commission during the discussion of draft resolutions an exchange of opinions emerged on the question of the delineation of functions between party and state organs. This conversation was interesting and meaningful, and we ended it on a wave of mutual understanding. But, at the initiative of certain commission members whom everyone supported, I was asked to convey to the conference the essence of the discussion, since there has been some misunderstanding of the proposals on this issue, particularly concerning the recommendation of party committee secretaries for the posts of soviet chairmen.

Obviously, what was said in the report was insufficient. This can be explained: The report concerned an enormous range of problems applying to all directions of restructuring. An explanation is possible but, clearly, the question nonetheless should be clarified.

Here, Comrades, it is important to bear in mind the starting point—our strategic line in restructuring. It is being implemented in the interests of people, and the people should be the main character in it. Hence the social thrust of the restructuring policy applied to people and to overcoming everything negative that existed in preceding periods, in order to ensure that the people's general state and their dignity and living conditions constantly improve. Hence too the gamble [stavka] on democratization in its broadest sense—in the economy and the political and spiritual spheres—in order to provide real opportunities for involving people in all restructuring processes, since people are the main characters in restructuring. It is the people that are called on to play the decisive, revolutionary role, and not the apparatus or any component of our political system—however important.

We have launched the process of democratizing the spiritual sphere and have created a social atmosphere in the country which will make it possible to discuss all the questions of concern to us—questions which must be answered—just as we are doing right here at the conference. We are extensively involved in a radical economic reform. Today it covers tens of millions of people, and tomorrow it will cover hundreds of millions—the entire national economy and the entire country. This is a large-scale and profound process. It is naive to think that in such an enormous country with its accumulated problems we can just go to sleep today, wake up tomorrow, and everything will be fine. We must eschew these illusions. We will have to do an enormous amount of work, and it will take revolutionary endurance—those who endure are the ones who triumph. Unfortunately,

certain people in our country are scared of the democratization processes launched in the country and the movement of social ideas, and are panicking and shouting for help! Others are unhappy that things are not changing overnight, from one day to the next, and demand that something be done immediately, that we should do something drastic, and so forth.

No; comrades. This would be the simplest line, but it would be wrong. We have launched an extensive process and involved ourselves in a radical economic reform; next in line is reform of the political system. We have approached this as a result of the development of restructuring itself and its internal logic. Such reform is quite simply vitally necessary for us.

Why? Many people remember what it was like in the past and those who are younger should know about it. After all, in the postwar period there have already been major undertakings of a sociopolitical nature on several occasions in our country. Take the September 1953 plenum. Vasiliy Aleksandrovich Starodubtsev was speaking now and everything he said was correct. I support him as an innovator, a thinking man devoted to the cause, to the land, from whose example we could teach others. So the September plenum gave a tremendous impetus to the development of the countryside, everything began to get going then. I was working as a machinery and tractor station machine operator at the time and I remember vividly that it was the resurrection of the countryside. But as early as 1958 everything had gotten bogged down. You also remember the March 1965 Plenum. It was not simply a plenum on agricultural issues. It was a plenum on how to conduct matters in the country in general, on how to shape policy on a scientific, democratic basis, with society's participation, on how the economy should be led and how the party should act. If the ideas voiced at the time had been transformed into deeds, we would have made confident headway. Incidentally, the 8th 5-Year Plan, under the influence of this approach, was the best of all recent plans. But the March Plenum and the agrarian policy also got bogged down.

The reform initiated in industry in 1965 got bogged down in exactly the same way. Yet at the time, Comrades, almost the same thing was being decided as we are providing for today in the economic reform, and there is much from it that we are using.

What went wrong? Everything was based in the political system, in methods of leading society through commands and orders. That is why I tell you frankly that unless we reform the political system all our undertakings, all the large-scale projects we have initiated will be delayed. That is why I disagree with Leonid Ivanovich Abalkin, whose speech smells strongly of economic determinism and in general of an underassessment of the superstructure which we have decided to reform. He expressed himself in a spirit suggesting that it is not very important how delegates are elected, how a session is held, or what political institutions there will be. Yet the report did not discuss just any old thing but the very major reform which the conference, our people, and indeed the entire world can already see. It is a pity that Comrade Abalkin has not seen this. (Applause).

Economic laws must be understood and used. But socialism, Lenin said, is the masses' living creation. The masses can join in all the processes of society's development when the necessary prerequisites for this, the mechanisms of democracy in all spheres—political, economic and spiritual—exist. We have done a lot in the spiritual sphere and, however difficult it may be, we will conduct a radical economic reform. But all this will get bogged down unless we reform the political system. (Applause).

The ideas placed at the basis of the reform are known to all. Incidentally, these ideas of ours would be worth nothing at all if they had been thought up solely in the Politburo by a group of people and were of an impractical nature. For 3 years now we have been accumulating ideas about how we should approach this question correctly. We have turned to our history to derive lessons, to understand why everything happened that way: Why a country with enormous potential was in a grave situation, in a precrisis state, why we were dissatisfied with the way that society and the economy were functioning. This analysis made it possible to draw specific conclusions in order to discuss the present and the future knowledgeably. For 3 years we have also accumulated our own experience in managing affairs and had many setbacks, but we are growing wiser not with every passing year but with every passing day.

I can see how the work of the Central Committee is changing from one plenum to the next. Life and the logic of restructuring are raising us all and, combined with glasnost and the development of the socialist pluralism of opinions, people are opening up and new ideas are appearing. We have an opportunity for selecting the best of these ideas and once again selecting them collectively.

So, everything we have proposed to the party and to society is the fruit of our joint thinking. And let's discuss these proposals responsibly and seriously.

The cornerstone of democratization is the regeneration of the soviets as full organs of the people's power formed on the basis of the principles of a new electoral system and ensuring the fullest possible expression of the diverse interests existing in our society. That is the first point.

Second, as a result of the reform, soviets must acquire full power in their region—rayon, city, oblast, republic, and so on. This must be enshrined in appropriate legislative acts. Moreover, the expansion of soviets' rights must be given a material backing—and this was said in the report. The shortcoming in all past decisions was indeed the fact that they said a lot about what a soviet must do, including the coordination of the work of all

organizations situated in a given territory, but always ending on the reservation: "within the limits of its powers." During the meeting with secretaries just before the Central Committee Theses were prepared, Filipp Vasilyevich Popov, secretary of the Altay party kraykom, who addressed you yesterday, said: I spent 7 years working as an oblispolkom chairman. You read the latest resolution on soviets and your heart is lifted: Now, you think to yourself, the soviets will really gain power, we will start functioning. And suddenly you come to the end: "within the limits of its powers." You then start looking for these "powers" with a magnifying glass, and they are nowhere to be found.

And so now we must solve everything properly. We must, moreover, bear in mind that we have to elaborate a political line. Starting with this conference, we must start setting an example of how a political vanguard functions. We must not prescribe 10 percent or 20 percent to be paid into soviets' budgets: This is already something to be specifically worked out with participation by republics, krays, and oblasts. We must primarily define the direction and elaborate the political line: How is the power of soviets to be revived. This is our task. Of course, no line will emerge without specific action, and we need specific ideas and arguments which can later crystallize into political directives.

Viktor Ivanovich Popov and other comrades who have spoken here need not worry that people now apparently want the soviets to be commanded by labor collectives. No. Here we must establish mutual relations on a strictly legal basis, on definite normatives. The territory must, as it were, feel the effect of enterprises located in it. And they must have a respectful attitude toward local authority. It is, after all constituted by the people who work in these enterprises and who are interested in the solution of not only departmental but also general territorial questions. This living dialectic must be expressed in the appropriate legislative acts. Of course, economic questions must be solved regardless of whether a given enterprise is subordinate to the oblast, the republic, or the union.

The next very important aspect concerns the demarcation of functions between party and state organs. The party has been dealing with this question ever since Lenin's time. Something was achieved under Lenin, but the administrative edict system triumphed after that. It led to the well-known deformations, to the point where we overloaded the party with functions that were inappropriate to it and rendered the soviets lifeless. As a result of being overloaded with all current problems, the party could not tackle many of the major political questions of the development of socialism and our country. This produced a loss; we lost a lot. Look at how many desperate problems there are! They demand theoretical analysis, the elaboration of appropriate policy and then of mechanisms to secure its implementation. The delegate from Nizhniy Tagil said bluntly, like a worker, that there are many questions to be solved. True enough, he called for fist-banging. This can be done, Comrades. If you agree with this, let us start doing it. (Applause)

But you know that this isn't what we need. When resolving the tasks of renewing the party and society as a whole we must refrain from the old methods, which after all reduced our society to a difficult state. (Applause)

I shall never agree with that approach; I take my stand here and I say to you honestly and bluntly: This is my firm position. Unless we involve the people in the processes of management no apparatus (ours numbers 18 million people and we spend R40 billion a year on its upkeep) will be able to cope with it. And the apparatus has not coped because the system of management of the economy and society as a whole needs the radical changes that we have been speaking about today and which we have been carrying out for the past 3 years. I am convinced that we are on the right track. (Applause)

If we really want to revive the soviets we must set about doing so thoroughly.

At present many questions are resolved here by party committees and their sectoral departments. It is necessary to rid the party of this and to really revive it on Leninist principles—as society's political vanguard called on to ensure the study of the most important questions of our country's life and the prospects for progress. The party must formulate ideology, organize the masses, be in close contact with people, inspire them, support them, and defend them. We need the kind of party which develops an intelligent and far-sighted cadre policy in the interests of restructuring.

Finally, if we, in our multinational country, do not take account of the interests of each republic or of autonomy, restructuring will not work. It will be successful only when every nation and ethnic group feels it is a fully-fledged participant in the nationwide cause and realizes that this is all in our common interests and in the interests of each nation. (Applause)

This requires vast intellectual, theoretical, and political activity. I have been listening to many of our scientists—some of them provide a serious analysis and help us when it is a question of major shortcomings in the existing system but, to be frank, there is a lack of constructive suggestions and new ideas.

But we must promote restructuring, and the people want it to move faster. That is why the party must begin the scientific consideration of fundamental processes. We have many problems now connected with agrarian policy, which needs to be refined and improved so that it matches the present stage of restructuring and society's needs. National questions are also knocking at the doors and windows of our home. We have begun to study them, and they require a Central Committee plenum to

be held. The problems of educating young people and training the new shift must be studied. These are all questions of great importance and vast significance for our country's fate. They must be resolved because the party must be freed of functions alien to it and must launch forceful work in all these political areas. It is the party which must do this; I see no other force here. Everyone who tries to cast doubt on the party's role and significance is resolutely rebuffed here. Some try to claim that the conclusion to be drawn from the past is that the party must be restricted. No, comrades, that is not the point! That is not it. If this virus—distrust and doubt about the purpose of our party—suddenly appeared among us, that would be the greatest gift we could make to the opponents of restructuring. (Applause)

The party must regenerate itself on Leninist principles as the political vanguard and develop its potential. Society expects that. All the progressive world expects this. I am sure that the CPSU, which has embarked on a bold analysis, assumed responsibility, and exposed itself to critical fire, can cope with this. Many are criticizing the CPSU now—in the country and in the world. It doesn't matter: Our party is strong, it can withstand all this and formulate a correct policy and carry society forward.

Such a party can really be called a political vanguard. Our Leninist party is such already and will be so to an even greater extent in the future! (Applause)

Now about the soviets, which receive tremendous executive power, authority, and rights. What is the result in this connection? As organs consisting of the people's representatives, our soviets have now been reduced to the status of aides to their own ispolkoms.

I sat on ispolkoms for many years—for 9 years as first secretary of Stavropol party Kraykom—and before that, being a gorkom secretary, I sat on the city soviet. So I know from the inside what it is like. The ispolkom schedules sessions. It determines the agenda: It does not matter whether a particular question is necessary or whether it is knocking on the door; the ispolkom raises it when it is convenient for it to do so. The entire apparatus is under the ispolkom, and the executive administrations are under the ispolkom. Wherever a deputy moves, he again ends up on an executive organ.

Today, comrades, the soviets have ended up in second-rate and even third-rate positions as representative organs. At best, they are ordered about by the ispolkom. And if we want to revive the soviets, we must, above all, revive the very kind of soviet which represents people and gives it corresponding rights, so that precisely its power is the source of all other authority.

Of course, as I have already said, the soviet must take shape on a different basis. Active people must come into it. Clearly, we have no need for cumbersome soviets. We will think about this later. It is important now to clarify our approaches. And the soviet must form the ispolkom and select through commissions, having discussed leaders of administrations beforehand.

At the same time, those who lead administrations in the ispolkom have no business in the soviet. Right now all executive officers are also deputies and members of the soviet, and they themselves determine what to do. But who is going to control them? That is why, comrades, we are planning a sharp change.

Do not think that everyone will applaud us. But if we want to revive the soviets, that is the path we must take.

And, with the exception of its chairman, all ispolkom members do not have to be deputies. The ispolkom is a cabinet appointed by the soviet to execute its decisions.

And for a soviet to start working, its authority must be backed up by the party's authority.

We have no reason to feel shy before either the people or the world. We are the ruling party, and the ruling party in any country forms the government and exercises executive power at various levels. Some parties accede to power through the processes of a revolution, by peaceful or nonpeaceful means, and others by way of election campaigns, but the party which is in power today nominates candidates and puts them through democratic mechanisms.

This is our party's position, and we do not renounce the role of the ruling party in the country. On the contrary, we want to confirm it, and we acknowledge that we feel our increased responsibility at the stage of restructuring. And, this being so, we must obviously back up the soviets' sovereignty with the party's authority. Incidentally, this idea was prompted from below, in letters from Communists. We began discussing it, then we opened it up to a wide range of people, we consulted legal experts, and I met three times with obkom and Central Committee secretaries. They did not all accept it at once. But when they started thinking, they saw for themselves that this will help the party to revive itself as the political vanguard, rid itself of functions not peculiar to it, and, at the same time, enhance the role of the soviets. If we do not do this, the present tradition is so strong that everything will remain as it was.

Therefore it is expedient in the soviet to elect the chairman and the Presidium, which will include the chairmen of standing commissions. The Presidium will not be directly in charge of the ispolkom. No, that is a matter for the soviet and for sessions. Since the ispolkom is entrusted with responsibility for the execution of decisions, it too must not hinder by means of petty tutelage.

Some comrades say: Let the party secretary stay on the ispolkom. But then he himself becomes an executive officer. And who will control the execution of the political decisions adopted at the session? He who decides also executes, but who will call to account? And this is why it turns out like this: A decision is adopted, but it just lies there and is not fulfilled.

I have greatly extended the bounds of the arguments of this thesis so that no one gets the idea that there is any intention of forcing through some idea on the quiet, relying on the conference's authority. No, comrades, it is necessary to move openly here, understanding the tremendous nature of what we are undertaking. We must rely on the party's authority and revive the soviets. If we bring about a clash between these two key forces of our political system, nothing will come of it. It will make no sense. The whole crux of the matter is to ensure their organic combination.

Under the new demands, which we will keep repeating, secretaries at all levels will be elected from among two, three, or more candidates by secret ballot at plenums. This means that they must be tested in a democratic manner and then recommended. Party secretaries will have to proceed via the soviets and representatives of working people—one more campaign, so to speak. They will discuss him, and it will not be known whether his candidacy will be put to a vote. Not for nothing do we say: "As a rule." This means that things will not be like this everywhere, that somebody else might be nominated. But then the question will arise: Why is the secretary not elected? Then the party committee should look into just who heads it.

In other words, this means: first, additional obligations, and, second, control of the party by working people. The party is being checked in democratic fashion, as it were. But this is necessary in order to be able to rely on the people's will. In resolving this question we must eschew a narrow, egotistical approach. Let us forget during the conference what our jobs are, and let us discuss in a spirit of party comradeship how to ensure the effective functioning of our political system. If we relate everything to our own position, we will never get out of our present situation. We have attempted to take a realistic view of the entire political process and have involved the entire party and people in it—openly and democratically. I think that we will come up with the right proposals.

That is what I wanted to say at the commission's request. This is not yet a conclusion, comrades. (Applause)

Razumovskiy, OGONEK Editor Speak

PM0107091588 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 1 Jul 88 Single Edition pp 1-4

[TASS report on 30 June session of 19th All-Union CPSU Conference: "More Democracy, More Socialism"]

[Excerpts] [Passage omitted] V.V. Shcherbitskiy, who was in the chair, gave the floor to G.P. Razumovskiy.

In accordance with the conference's instruction, the speaker said, at a special session with the participation of the relevant specialists and officials, the Mandate Commission examined a publication by the journal OGONEK relating to the charge of bribery leveled against individual conference delegates. According to a report from the USSR Prosecutor General, the USSR Prosecutor's Office has not taken the decision to bring criminal charges for bribery or other crimes against any of the people elected delegates to the conference.

The information cited in the article "Confrontation" needs to be specially checked. In the opinion of the Mandate Commission this should be done by the USSR Prosecutor General and the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee. They should report the results. But that will require time and quite in-depth investigations must be carried out. [passage omitted]

On proposals from the floor from the conference delegates, the floor was given to V.A. Korotich, chief editor of OGONEK. It is obvious, he said that many people have read the article cited here, which was published in our journal. I am very grateful to the Mandate Commission for undertaking an examination of this question.

The speaker described how this article was prepared. The investigators carrying out the case supplied journalists with specific evidence. They said that some of the people implicated in these cases, against whom a great deal of evidence had been collected, cannot be charged, that the investigation has the right to inform party organs that there are serious suspicions against particular Communists. Until the party organs examine the question of proceedings against a Communist, his case as a rule is not taken to court.

The result is a vicious circle—people who cannot be charged cannot be found guilty and without being found guilty they cannot be charged.

The chief editor of OGONEK supported the Mandate Commission's proposal that the study of all circumstances of this case be assigned to the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee and the USSR Prosecutor General. [passage omitted]

Sklyarov Sums Up Third Day

LD3006210788 Moscow TASS in English 2037 GMT 30 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 30 TASS—"The discussions at the conference are keener than they were in the past. Without being confused, delegates discuss straightforwardly and candidly the matters which are the cause of concern for them", Yuriy Sklyarov, head of the press center of the Soviet Communists' forum, said at a briefing on the results of the third day of the work of the 19th all-union party conference.

Many delegates speak without an advance preparation but even those who go to the podium with summaries of their speeches use them rarely, Yuriy Sklyarov went on. He called today's speeches by delegates in the debates on the report of the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee as fearless. By way of example the head of the press center mentioned the speech by Vladimir Melnikov, head of the party organisation of the Komi Autonomous Republic, in which he criticized Solomentsev, Gromyko, Afanasyev and Arbatov.

Yuriy Sklyarov informed journalists in detail about today's remarks by Mikhail Gorbachev, the content of speeches by many delegates. He also said that 20 delegates spoke in debates on the report on the third day of the conference's proceedings and that a total of 261 delegates registered for taking the floor as of today. The head of the press center served notice that the forum took into account the criticism aired yesterday and let not only senior officials whom people [are] accustomed to see[ing] on podiums have the floor.

Journalists put many questions in connection with the recent publication in the magazine OGONEK, which said that there are people among the delegates to the party conference, who compromised themselves with bribe-taking. Yuriy Sklyarov said that "the conference today intrusted the office of Public Prosecutor of the USSR to conduct a thorough investigation into this question. The Office of Public Prosecutor should weigh up extensively all circumstances and evaluate the publication—whether it is authentic or not".

Georgiy Kryuchkov, deputy head of the department of the organisational and party work of the CPSU Central Committee, said responding to questions that he would take part in the commission drafting a resolution on combatting bureaucracy. Fifty-three delegates were elected members of this commission. Twenty-seven people spoke at today's session of the commission, they put forward over a hundred specific proposals.

The commission deemed it necessary to make several substantive additions to the initial draft resolution. The delegates declared for defining bureaucratism as a social evil impeding perestroika, for elaborating legal conditions for intensifying the struggle against bureaucratism. Vigorous and creative work is under way, Georgiy Kryuchkov noted.

Duration 'Impossible' To Judge

LD0107015888 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2200 GMT 30 Jun 88

[Text] The number of those who want to speak in the debates at the national party conference has increased reportedly to 261. In that connection, senior Communist Party official Yuriy Sklyarov has told a news conference that at this point it is impossible to say when the conference will end.

[Begin Sklyarov recording, here and subsequently, in Russian with superimposed English translation] We have been construing ways of satisfying the delegates' desire to express their opinion to the greatest extent. On Wednesday, there were 24 speakers, 20 more have spoken on Thursday and there are even more applications.

Among those who want to speak at the conference is Boris Yeltsin, former Communist Party leader in Moscow. He put his name on the list of speakers after the delegates to the conference said they wanted him to explain his position. [end recording]

One of the questions asked at the briefing concerned charges of bribery brought against several members of the delegation from Uzbekistan by the Moscow weekly magazine OGONEK. Yuriy Sklyarov said that no names have been mentioned either by the magazine or at the conference.

[Begin Sklyarov recording] The Credentials Commission has reported to the conference that it has asked the office of the USSR Procurator General to inquire into the affair to find out whether there are any reasons for such charges. (?Any) delegate from Uzbekistan may come under suspicion so it is vitally important to hold a thorough investigation. [end recording]

Roundup of Proceedings

LD3006165488 Moscow TASS in English 1557 GMT 30 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 30 TASS—The 19th All-Union Conference of the CPSU continued its work in the Kremlin today.

The morning session was presided over by N.I. Ryzhkov, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR.

The delegates to the conference continued discussing Mikhail Gorbachev's report "On Progress in Implementing the Decisions of the 27th Party Congress and the Tasks of Promoting Perestroyka."

The following comrades spoke in deliberations: V.I. Postnikov, general director of the broiler production association "Stavropolskoye" of Stavropol Territory, V.A. Yarin, operator of a mill at the Nizhni Tagil metallurgical complex named after V.I. Lenin of Sverdlovsk Region, A.A. Logunov, rector of Moscow State University named after M.V. Lomonosov, V.I. Melnikov, first secretary of the Komi Regional Committee of the CPSU, D.I. Patiashvili, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Georgia, V.A. Starodubtsev, chairman of the agro-industrial association "Novomoskovskoye" of Tula Region.

M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, who is the chairman of the commission for the elaboration of draft resolutions "On Progress in Implementing the Decisions of the 27th Party Congress and the Tasks of Promoting Perestroyka" and "On Democratisation of Soviet Society and a Reform of the Political System," came forward with explanations concerning a number of principled matters raised by the delegates to (?this).

The afternoon session, which was presided over by V.V. Shcherbitskiy, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine, was addressed by G.P. Razumovskiy, chairman of the Credentials Commission. He said that the facts contained in the article headlined "Opposition" and published by OGONEK (Flame) magazine were in need of a more thorough verification, and suggested that the work be entrusted to the Party Control Committee under the CPSU Central Committee and to the Procurator's Office of the USSR. The suggestion was endorsed.

On the request of delegates the editor-in-chief of the magazine OGONEK, V.A. Korotich, presented his explanations on the matter.

Then the following comrades took part in the discussion of the report: K.Z. Romazanov, a steel worker from the Karaganda metallurgical plant, V.I. Saranskikh, first secretary of the Cherepovetsk CPSU City Committee, L.P. Zhivetyeva, a livestock expert from the Pervomayskiy stud farm named after the 60th anniversary of the USSR in Novosibirsk Region, R.N. Nishanov, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Uzbekistan, I.D. Laptev, editor-in-chief of the newspaper IZVESTIYA.

The evening session was chaired by V.I. Vorotnikov, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation.

The speakers in the debate were the following comrades: S.N. Fedorov, director general of the inter-branch research and technical complex of eye micro surgery in Moscow, G.A. Borovik, chairman of the Soviet Peace Committee, V.M. Platonov, secretary of the party committee of the Chelyabinsk tractor works production amalgamation named after V.I. Lenin, O.M. Zakharova, an operator from the dressing plant No 12 of the Yakutalmaz (Yakut diamonds) research and production amalgmation, M. Fateyev, second secretary of the Leningrad Regional CPSU Committee, G.I. Zagaynov, head of a department at the Zhukovskiy central aerohydrodynamic institute, V.Yu. Nezhelskiy, a gas operator at the Osk-Khalilovo metallurgical complex in Novotroytsk, R.B.I. Songayla, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Lithuania, A.P. Aydak, chairman of the Leninskaya Iskra collective farm in the Chuvash Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic.

Azerbaijani Official Calls Transfer 'Unrealistic'

LD3006222588 Moscow TASS in English 2158 GMT 30 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 30 TASS—"I like it very much that the work of the 19th all-union party conference is marked by democratic character, that there is a free and acute discussion by delegates of all the questions agitating them," said president of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic Suleyman Tatliyev. He addressed journalists at the press centre of the 19th all-union party conference today.

In his opinion, the democratic character of debating on the report by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev "shows that the there is no return to the past when many leaders conveyed their opinion to the people as the ultimate truth."

Answering numerous questions from journalists about the situation in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Region which is in the composition of Azerbaijan, Suleyman Tatliyev said that posing the question of taking Nagorno-Karabakh out of the composition of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic and placing it under the administration of the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic is "unjustifiable" and "unrealistic". He explained his opinion by the fact that 475 thousand Armenians now reside in Azerbaijan, 120 thousand of them in Nagorno-Karabakh. "The question of Nagorno-Karabakh is extremely complex. Therefore it should be resolved with taking into consideration the interests of all nations and peoples living in our republic," he said.

Suleyman Tatliyev sees the solution of problems of Nagorno-Karabakh in the strengthening of the autonomy, development of the self-government in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Region, as well as in the consolidation of the economy, in meeting fuller social and cultural needs of the population of the region. "Vigorous measures are now taken for this purpose by the leadership of Azerbaijan and Armenia," he said.

KGB Proposals at Conference Noted

LD3006121888 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1105 GMT 30 Jun 88

Moscow, June 30 (TANJUG)—Among the Soviet citizens' numerous written proposals to the 19th party conference, the proposals by the Communists of the State Security Committee (KGB) have attracted much attention.

Their proposals are that a book of Lenin's unpublished works be printed, that criminal, party and administrative responsibility be established for those decisions which result in economic and ecological damage, that the opening of schools, study groups and clubs for national language studies anywhere in the Soviet Union not be prevented.

KGB Communists also propose that Zionism and anti-Semitism be condemned as dangerous to the socialist ideology and that the facts about Soviet economic aid to other countries as well as the efficiency and character of that aid be made public.

The proposal that "the best sociologists, lawyers, philosophers and other scientists establish guarantees which would hinder arbitrary interpretations of socialist pluralism" has attracted special attention.

This proposal is an imperative of the moment, since security organs are often faced with expressions of pluralism (demonstrations, meetings and such) which place them in a dilemma: How to react. With or without a baton.

Economist on 'Conflict' in Perestroyka Goals

LD3006222488 Moscow TASS in English 2111 GMT 30 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 30 TASS—In order to lead the Soviet economy out of stagnation, it is necessary, paradoxical as it is, to give up qualitative growth, believes Professor Nikolay Shmelyov, a leading expert of the Institute for U.S. and Canadian Studies at the USSR Academy of Sciences.

The guest of the 19th Soviet Communist Party conference today talked with journalists at the press centre of the conference.

"There is a conflict between two goals of perestroyka—acceleration of growth rates and the need for economic reform, transition to qualitative indicators and higher scientific and technical standards of products," he said.

"The belief that both tasks could be resolved simultaneously is a delusion. This situation justifies the existence of bureaucrats, the slaves of the system that advocates 'growth at any cost', which in fact leads to a slump, rather than a rise in production."

The Soviet economist pointed out that the idea of the need for transition to economic methods of management was clearly heard in statements by many delegates to the party forum.

The diktat of ministries stood in the way of transition to genuine cost-accounting, Shmelyov said. They set excessively high state orders thus denying the enterprises the opportunity of economic manoeuvre.

According to estimates, the share of the state order must be reduced to 20-25 per cent to ensure the best possible performance of Soviet economy, and the enterprises should be given the right to sell the remaining products on the market.

In Shmelyov's opinion, this target could be attained by the mid-1990s.

"Delegates to the conference give special attention to the food situation, a problem that remains most acute today," he said. "The discussion showed that this problem could be resolved by eliminating administrative pressure in agriculture, developing transportation, processing facilities and other types of the infra-structure, and introducing progressive methods of economic management, such as lease and family contracts."

Belorussian Officials Brief Press

LD3006223788 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1630 GMT 30 Jun 88

[Excerpt] [Announcer] At the press center of the 19th all-union party conference today, a meeting was held between journalists and representatives of the Belorussian delegation. Our correspondent Vladimir Nazarov reports:

[Nazarov] Everyone recognizes that this republic is in the vanguard of restructuring, judging by objective statistical data. Incidentally, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev talked about this in his report at the conference. In many respects those questions which many republics are just beginning to tackle have already been removed from the Belorussian agenda, as they say.

Journalists addressed a variety of questions to those who came to meet us. It seemed to me that the answers were sincere and frank. For example, Petr Kirillovich Kovalev, a worker in the Gomel agricultural machine works, criticized the essence of the state orders. He spoke about how the regularity, quality, and even the volume of output varies due to the inappropriate introduction of this innovation.

In reply to the question about his views on the speech writer Bondarev made at the party conference, Kovalev said that he considers this speech a wish to reconcile various groups, which have appeared in the country's creative organizations.

The same question about the privileges of major party, economic, and state officials in the republic was asked four times. Responding were Vladimir Petrovich Platonov, president of the Belorussian Academy of Sciences; Andrey Grigoriyevich Andreyev, head of the republican railway; and Yefrem Yevseyevich Sokolov, first secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee.

[Begin recording] [Platonov] As a scientist, I enjoy no special privileges. Furthermore, I can state this fact, for example: I have no state dacha.

[Andreyev] As an administrator who (?takes care of the railway) I do not enjoy any additional privileges either. I purchase in shops all I can, and this is quite sufficient. Just the same because there is a beautiful choice of books and everything else. Therefore, such problems do not exist.

[Sokolov] I, personally, as the first secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee, and my colleagues in the Central Committee or in the Central Committee of the Belorussian Communist Party; secretaries of oblast, city and rayon party committies, do not enjoy any privileges, except for the fact that in this country 2 days a week are allowed off. However, we have just half a day off, as a rule. As to any food products, perhaps this applies to some but not to our republic. The republic has been well provided with all food products and all consumer goods. We do have a chauffer-driven state car. As to dachas, not a single member of the party's staff in city, or oblast party committees or in the apparatus of the party Central Committee have dachas, except Politburo members. Members of the Politburo of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee do have state dachas. We pay a certain sum of money for them, depending on size. When we finish working either because of retirement or because of redundancy, we release the dachas and move to the flat that we normally have today. [end recording]

[Nazarov] This tradition of social justice which was established many years ago is perhaps a key to solving the riddle, as foreign correspondents put it, as to why Belorussia has so sharply gone forward in comparison with other republics.

At every press conference, questions are now always asked about the conference's reaction to the speech of academician Abalkin. This is what Yefrem Yevseyevich Sokolov, first secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee, noted in this respect.

[Begin Sokolov recording] Yes, in my speech, I expressed disagreement with Comrade Abalkin. Comrade Abalkin made the following statement: I am beginning to consider whether a one-party system can create a democratic state under the Soviet political system. When I was addressing the conference on behalf of the Belorussian delegation, I made this statement: The Belorussian party organization disagrees with his speech. It is not the number of parties in a state that determines democracy, but the platform from which the party works. [end recording] [passage omitted]

Latvian Writer on Nationalities Issue

LD0107034688 Moscow TASS in English 0134 GMT 1 Jul 88

[Text] Moscow June 30 TASS—"Every nation in the Soviet Union must have an opportunity to develop freely, with taking into account its specific national features and interests," said Janis Peters, the chairman of the board of the Union of Latvian Writers. He met today with journalists accredited at the press centre of the 19th All-Union Conference of the CPSU, which is in its third day in Moscow.

The opinion of the Latvian Communists on the nationalities question was clearly expressed in the speech delivered at the forum by first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Latvia Boris Pugo, delegate Peters noted. "We all subscribe to his view about the need for the restoration of Soviet federation of sovereign republics as visualised by Lenin. Every nation in a socialist law-governed state should have a greater independence than at present in the solution of economic and social problems, in the development of science and culture. New legislative acts should, perhaps, be introduced for this purpose, and old legislative acts should be upgraded."

"Just as many other delegations, we have brought to the conference proposals aimed at the widening of the rights and powers of union republics in the solution of economic and other matters", Janis Peters noted. "These proposals are now thoroughly analysed by the commission for the drafting of the resolution 'on inter-ethnic relations'. As a member of that commission I expect it to work out a political document combining the interests of all nations and peoples with general requirements of the country and precluding any manifestations of nationalism and chauvinism."

Delegates Stress Need for Discipline

LD0107083088 [Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 0600 GMT on 1 July carries a 3-minute report on proceedings at the 30 June session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference in Moscow.

The report includes an interview with Ye.V. Kachalovskiy, first deputy chairman of the Ukrainian Council of Ministers, and G.I. Revenko, first secretary of the Kiev Obkom, by correspondent Vera Shchelkunova during the interval at the conference.

Kachalovskiy says it is now time to pay more attention to discipline and self-discipline. Criticism alone will not help restructuring; it needs to be tied to work. He recalls Gorbachev's words asking people what they themselves have done for restructuring and notes:

"Unfortunately many speakers only alluded to criticism, that much is still not being finished. They talked about their own personal restructuring, of the collective aktiv where they work."

Revenko says: "I am deeply convinced that in a couple of days or so when we return from here we will have to answer the question: How much will people's lives become better? This is our chief concern. I share entirely the critical tone of the conference, the constructive proposals and the mutual exactingness, but nonetheless, returning to this question, I think that we need to conduct a very robust discussion today about the personal contribution of each and every one to improving matters in the provinces and in the center, so that people's lives should become better after the conference.

This is a fundamental question because we will be doing everything very well, as they say, organizationally, but this ought also to be reinforced materially. That is our opinion. Of course the differences of opinion are great at the conference; pretty varied, including diametrically opposed views, are to be heard, and this is natural if we want to become different. But it ought to lead to one thing, to going further, having united the best forces of restructuring, and I return once again to the point that the people should really feel this, in everything."

Soviet General on Restructuring in Army

LD3006222288 [Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1300 GMT on 30 June broadcasts a report by journalist Yakov Smirnov on a conversation between three Soviet generals during an interval at the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference in Moscow. The report begins with one of the generals, Lieutenant General Nikolay Maksimovich Chichevatov, expressing approval of Gorbachev's explanation today that local soviets will be headed by the first secretary of a party committee, an obkom, or a raykom.

Major General (Nauchenykh) then joins in the conversation, saying that if a party first secretary of any rank heads a local soviet, this will result in greater responsibility, more and better work, and more good products.

Colonel General Kovtunov, commander of the Central Asian Military District, then introduces himself and says:

"Well, what am I thinking about? How to work better! I have a single thought: We military men must extract a very great deal from the work of the party conference, draw conclusions for ourselves on restructuring work in the army regarding the quality of combat training, on improving the state of equipment and its mastering as quickly as possible. I think that after this conference we will work even better than we worked before."

Smirnov then asks: "We all know that the Army has always been a school for young people. Mothers and fathers willingly allowed their children to join the Army because they knew that their sons would return from the Army strong, courageous, competent [gramotnyy], and independent. Now we know that young people are entering the Army reluctantly. In connection with this, what tasks arise for the political bodies of management of the Army?"

The generals reply that more needs to be done in civilian life to prepare youths for service in the Soviet Army. More work must be done by the Komsomol, the schools, the military registration and enlistment offices, and the parents. Military-patriotic upbringing must be place on a higher level now so that Soviet officers and Soviet generals pay more visits to schools, have more frequent conversations with students and tell from their personal experience what is being done in the Army, what the conditions are, and what strenuous combat work is taking place. If better conditions are created in the Army, they say, young people will enter the Army to serve with pleasure.

Estonian Delegates Speak to Journalists

LD3006220788 Moscow TASS in English 2130 GMT 30 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 30 TASS—Estonian Communist Party delegates arrived at the 19th national conference with a collective platform worked out after consultations with the people and extensive comparison of views in the republic, Vajno Vaelaes, first secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee, has pointed out.

He and other delegates met newsmen at the party conference press centre today.

Replying to questions put by Soviet and foreign journalists, the Estonian Communists explained the essence of their stand concerning greater economic and social independence of the republic, specifically the issue of regional cost-accounting.

It was stressed that the idea of republican cost-accounting was already mentioned at the conference by delegates from Belorussia, Latvia, Lithuania, the Komi Autonomous Republic and others.

"Republican cost-accounting does not imply secession, it is neither independent economy nor local egoism," said Academician Mikhail Bronshtein, head of the political economy chair at Tartu State University. "Republican cost-accounting is designed to end contradictions between territories and departments and union ministries."

The delegates gave a full picture of today's social and political situation in Estonia. Journalists asked many questions about the role of the so-called People's Front in the republic's life. "The People's Front comes out in support of perestroyka," said Vaelaes.

Preliminary Reports on Conference Fourth Day

Gromyko Chairs Morning Session

LD0107074488 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0700 GMT 1 Jul 88

[Text] The 19th All-Union CPSU Conference is in its 4th day at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses. On the Presidium are Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and other party and government leaders. [video shows Gorbachev leading group followed by Gromyko, Ryzhkov, Razumovskiy, Yakovlev, and others following behind]

The morning session was opened by Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko. Speaking in the debates on the CPSU Central Committee report were Valentin Karpovich Mesyats, first secretary of the Moscow obkom, Anatoliy

Anisipovich Melnikov, a fitter in a chassis assembly shop at the Volzhskiy Motor Vehicle works in the 50-Letiya SSSR in Kuybyshev Oblast; Fedor Trofimovich Morgun, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Enviromental Protection; and Grigoriy Yakovlevich Baklanov, secretary of the USSR Writers Union Board, editor in chief of ZNAMYA. [video shows closeup of all these speakers]

The morning session of the conference is continuing.

Backstage Talk Reported

PM0107141488 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jul 88 Second Edition pp 1-2

[Report by special correspondents V. Kozhemyako, V. Loginov, Yu. Makhrin, G. Ovcharenko, and S. Pastukhov from the Kremlin Palace of Congresses: "In Heated Debates"]

[Text] Everyone has his work, everyone—the steelworker, the grain grower, the scientist—has his labor. The party conference is the united work, the joint labor of 5,000 Communists of the most diverse professions, who were delegated to the Kremlin Palace of Congresses by the country's army of nearly 20 million party members. It is the collective work of reason seeking the truth on the basis of accumulated experience; it is the mental labor of very many people joined by one feeling—concern for today and tomorrow.

In the period of preparations for the conference, PRAVDA alone received more than 75,000 letters from party and nonparty readers containing proposals on the CPSU Central Committee Theses and reflections, some more useful than others. And how many proposals Soviet citizens sent to other press organs and party bodies! The discussion became truly nationwide. We have been able to see this once again by listening to the conference delegates who have mounted the platform and by spending 3 days meeting and talking with them in the breaks between sessions.

Far away from their labor collectives and their party organizations—sometimes hundreds and even thousands of kilometers away—even here, behind the high walls of the Kremlin, the delegates, metaphorically speaking, feel the breath of millions of people, or, as V. Yarin, a metallurgist from Nizhniy Tagil, put it at the conference, see their comrades' eyes before them. Clapping for the speakers (although not always to encourage them, sometimes, on the contrary, to interrupt unnecessary verbiage), voting for this or that decision, and speaking aloud their thoughts and doubts, the party's envoys are undoubtedly acting and speaking for the masses. But as a river is made up of springs and streams that converge, so the masses are made up of individual people, personalities. The brighter and more independent the personality, the more powerful its "head of water"—the intellectual potential, the moral charge. No, the Leningrad worker V. Smirnov did not agree with that apparently timely proposal, the holding of certification of Communists, and he spoke out from the conference platform even against the weighty authority of the keynote speaker (when has that happened before?!), because he finds this campaign objectively unnecessary at present. Nor was V. Postnikov, general director of the "Stavropolskoye" association, afraid to name from the platform specific perpetrators of bureaucratic evil among high-ranking leaders, because the interests of the cause are more precious to him.

Observing the course of the conference from one session to the next and analyzing its most varied events, we became increasingly convinced that disputes and debates are fruitful when the talk directly concerns the Soviet person—his "ordinary" concerns and needs, that is, our life and yours. And that has not always happened in the period of preparations for the conference or in the process of its work. From time to time someone forgets about the people's fate and takes advantage of the opportunity to speak to settle personal scores or assert group ambitions....

We met, for instance, with V. Zheleznyak, chairman of the Lenin Kolkhoz in Gomel Oblast. At the time, he was dissatisfied. Speakers are talking about all kinds of things from the conference platform, down to the problems of literary criticism, yet they are silent about the most important thing. They will not suggest to Zheleznyak what he should do, for instance, about the lease contract, because the contract has started to get in the way of science, and without science he cannot achieve a 100 quintal grain yield....

"Criticism, Vitaliy Ignatyevich, including literary criticism," we try to reason with the chairman, "is a political issue."

"And grain? Grain is the most important politics of all!" the chairman replies.

Well, our interlocutor was right. After that, more than once we heard speeches from the platform which did indeed discuss the most important thing—how our people live.

"Our people, who have borne so much, who have suffered so many things," Ye. Streltsova, department chief at one of the capital's stores, reflects in the break, "deserve to be short of nothing—not food products, nor goods in everyday demand, nor well appointed housing. In my opinion that should be the most specific aim of restructuring. I am entirely on the side of those delegates who come out resolutely against substituting empty assurances for action and half-measures for real renewal that everyone can feel."

Not far away, a group of party workers from the Moscow area have gathered. What are they discussing so eagerly? The role of rayon and city party components. That has always been and still is very important. In the opinion of

V. Mikhaylov, first secretary of Lyubertsy CPSU Gorkom, the conference has not yet discussed sufficiently or fully the problems of the formation of their apparatus in such a way that it gives party committees more help in fulfilling their direct political, organizational, and educational functions.

"It has been said in the report and in the debates," V. Yurchenko, first secretary of Pavlovskiy CPSU Raykom, Krasnodar Kray, said, sharing his views with us, "that after the conference it would be possible to embark in the near future on creating a new structure of the party apparatus. But we have yet to develop specific ideas on what concrete form the apparatus should take. It should be stated more clearly, in particular, that sector departments on party committees are unnecessary."

Yes, truth is born in debate; and well substantiated, considered decisions are born in comprehensive, in-depth discussions. A marked influence was exerted on the nature of the debates by the speech of the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee as chairman of the commission for drafting the main resolutions. The debates are becoming more constructive and fruitful. But that does not mean "unanimity" has set in.

At one of the little tables in the foyer, a heated debate is taking place between delegates from Smolensk Oblast—N. Yemelina, director of the knitwear factory, and V. Zhendarov, engineer at the Smolensk locomotive depot.

"I am in favor," the worker says, "of strengthening the party's role and influence of the Soviets. But the idea of combining the leader of the Soviet and the local party organ in a single person still causes me some doubt."

"If the Soviet chairman is elected on a genuinely democratic basis, if it is a knowledgeable person with great experience, it will work," N. Yemelina objects. "But this is what I cannot understand at all: The conference is in its 3d day, the question of the division of the functions of party and Soviet organs is being discussed, and yet not one Soviet worker has spoken."

Another meeting—with Militia Captain V. Sukhov, delegate from Sverdlovsk.

"It is very good," Viktor Ivanovich said, "that the subject of the rule of law and the observance of every person's rights, interests, and freedoms is prominent at the conference. Only by creating a truly law-based state will we ensure the supremacy of the law, before which everyone will be equal. I am eagerly awaiting the results of the work of the commission preparing a draft resolution 'On Legal Reform.'"

That is also awaited by the conference's guests, Academician V. Kudryavtsev, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the State and Law, and Doctor of Juridical Sciences Professor B. Lazarev. On the eve of the party forum, Boris Mikhaylovich wrote an article in PRAVDA on the law-based state, and now he is sincerely pleased that many of his ideas, like the proposals of other scientists and legal practitioners, were reflected in the report.

"The ideas set forth in the report and in many delegates' speeches," he believes, "ensure the political, ideological, and organizational prerequisites for creating a socialist law-based state. I say 'prerequisites,' because the real work of creating a law-based state lies ahead, and we must not think it will be easy."

"We are all well aware," V. Kudryavtsev adds, "that the creation of a law-based state is one of the main guarantees of the irreversibility of restructuring. The party itself took on the initiative of restructuring the political system, including its own role in the new conditions. I do not know of any ruling party that would so boldly raise questions that affect its own place in society. And that is an assertion of faith in the future."

Delegates are engaged in a particularly keen discussion of relations between nations. The leitmotiv of these conversations is to strengthen trust and fraternity. The poet Rasul Gamzatov is agitated:

"It is a bad thing for neighbor to abuse neighbor. It causes me heartfelt grief. I want to be heard by our brothers—the Armenians and Azerbaijanis: Do not give way to emotions."

Delegates from Armenia describe the events over Nagornyy Karabakh. Shch. Davtyan, first secretary of Sisianskiy party raykom, draws the conclusion:

"You cannot explain them solely in terms of the actions of extremists."

Makhmud Omarov and Firidun Mamedov are from Sumgait. The former is a steelworker at a pipe rolling plant, the latter a member of the apparatus of the "Orgsintez" association.

"We had always been proud of our city as a harmonious international family," they say. "But now we are ashamed to look people in the eyes. That is where it can lead you if you neglect educational work, especially among young people! A great deal remains to be done to rectify the situation fully."

Getting to the bottom of things.... That is one of the most characteristic features of the conference. Its delegates are not indifferent people, they want to study as deeply as possible every problem that is raised for discussion, every phenomenon that is mentioned, every fact reported from the platform. To study them, and to work out their own, personal attitude.

As already noted in our previous reportage, the question of the role and responsibility of the mass media has been raised repeatedly at the conference. Today it was spoken

of by R. Nishanov, first secretary of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee; S. Fedorov, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences; and I. Laptev, chief editor of IZVESTIYA. The press is doing great, useful work in helping the party to advance restructuring. Not for nothing was the work of journalists assessed so highly in the report at the conference. But it is well known that much will be asked of him to whom much is given. In entrusting to press workers such a sharp weapon as the press, television, and radio, the party demands that they use it skillfully. After all, this is a very important part of the partywide cause, without which democracy and glasnost are inconceivable.

And of course, it is unforgivable if someone who takes offense at criticism of himself personally, even when it is absolutely justified, bears a grudge against all the mass media, seeking to put a "curb" on them, as Mikhail Ulyanov put it, to take them in hand so that they do not "entrench themselves" too much in criticism and glasnost. Of course, it is understandable if people are offended, but how can we agree with the desire of certain workers to make the press tame and toothless and deprive it of the militancy it has acquired on the crest of the restructuring wave?

In any event, we heard a certain amount of ill will at that point in the speech by F. Popov, first secretary of Altay CPSU Kraykom, where he spoke about the article "Opposition" published in the journal OGONEK. It described the work of the investigators of important cases at the USSR general prosecutor's office who are investigating the so-called "Uzbek affair." Among other things, the article said that bribe-taking asssociated with Uzbekistan had spread even to certain responsible officials who have become delegates to the 19th party conference. A distressing echo of the times of stagnation, painful metasases from those times?

Let us recall that at the preceding session it was decided to instruct the Credentials Commission to find out to what extent the accusation is justified. G. Razumovskiy, chairman of the Credentials Commission, reports today: According to a report from the USSR general prosecutor, the prosecutor's office has not decided to take criminal proceedings against any delegate. The information contained in the article needs to be specially investigated by the USSR Prosecutor's Office and the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee. But of course, that will take time.

The auditorium demands explanations from the editorial office. V.Korotich, chief editor of OGONEK, mounts the rostrum. He says that the article was based on information from the group for investigating important cases at the general prosecutor's office. And he hands over to the conference presidium documents concerning four delegates whose reputation has been called into question.

"The press is the instrument of glasnost," A. Vlasov, USSR minister of internal affairs, says in the corridors. "And that means it is a good helper in the work of leaders at all levels. That is why it is strange to hear party workers calling for journalists to be kept in line. They must be supported, not robbed of their voice!"

Continuing the theme, Yu. Manayenkov, first secretary of Lipetsk CPSU Obkom, said:

"Both from the conference platform and in the breaks you hear reproaches: 'The press is to blame,' 'Journalists are hampering restructuring.' Complaints, for the purposes of checking, should be addressed not to the mass media in general, but to the specific author, the specific publication. There are clear excesses here. But I would not advise journalists to take offense, I would advise them to think once again how great a journalist's responsibility is for his every word!"

Disputes, debates, and polemics continue in the breaks between sessions, in the hotels where the delegates are staying, and at the conferences of the commissions for drafting the conference resolutions. A. Seleznev, first secretary of Kursk CPSU Obkom, tells us how stormy the previous day's session was in the commission for preparing the resolution "On Legal Reform." The debate lasted more than an hour, but even then they did not reach full agreement. They agreed to meet again tomorrow....

'Final Session' in Progress

LD0107155088 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1534 GMT 01 Jul 88

[Text] [Music] [Announcer] The final session of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference is in progress in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has provided information on the progress of work in the commissions preparing the six conference resolutions. The participants in the conference have just adopted the resolution on the course of implementation of the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and tasks in the deepening of restructuring.

The final session of the conference is continuing. [music]

Estonian Program for CPSU Conference

LD0107152488 Tallinn RAHUA HAAL in Estonian 18 Jun 88 p 1

[Unattributed article: "The Main Points of the Estonian Communist Party Delegation's Stand at the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference"]

[Text] As has already been announced, meetings of the delegates elected on behalf of the Estonian SSR for the 19th all-union party conference have taken place. They

discussed the main points of the Estonian Communist Party delegation's stand at the 19th all-union party conference. We are publishing the draft of the document as follows:

The CPSU Central Committee Theses to the 19th all-union party conference are to be endorsed. Based on them, and taking into consideration the proposals of Estonian party organizations, labor collectives, and working groups set up at the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee, the Presidium of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet, and the Estonian SSR Council of Ministers, the following points are to be presented to the conference for discussion on behalf of the Estonian party organization, with the aim of providing a contribution on our part toward the working out of the resolutions at the conference which would secure fundamental changes in all areas of life in our society.

1. In the Economy [subhead]

Starting from the 13th 5-year-plan period, to begin switching the Estonian SSR over to economic self-governing and self-management, in the process of which both local and all-union interests would coincide. A USSR Law is to be worked out which would regulate in detail interrelations between the republics and also their relations with the central organs of the state. Mutual rights and obligations should be envisaged in the law, in respect to questions of governing the whole country and the republics (including the principles of subordination in different branches of the national economy, the limits of legislative independence in a union republic, and other such matters)

The functions of managing the economy (the area of state defense excluded) must be transferred from both union and republican and USSR joint authority into the juridiction of republics. It is also necessary to transfer the setting of prices, tariffs, payment for work and the solving of questions of finance and credit policies, within the produced national income, into the jurisdiction of the republics;

The concept of USSR state ownership should be made more specific, while establishing in the USSR Constitution that the total union state ownership (state defense excluded) is made up of the state property of all union republics. The union republics would be the rightful masters of this property and of the national income on their own territory. In the economic sphere, the republics would meet their duties to the union organs and other union republics on the basis of contracts which determine the mutual relations of both sides upon an equivalent and self-managing basis.

2. In Ecology [subhead]

The rights for both use and protection of natural resources to be conferred upon union republics. The economic development of a region to be directly linked with the local ecological situation;

Specific measures to be worked out in the sphere of land, water, forest, and other legislation, in order to guarantee environmental and nature utilization rights to a union republic;

Charges to be imposed for the use of all natural resources, and sanctions to be levied for depositing waste in the natural environment.

3. In Nationalities Policy and National Relations [subhead]

An effective mechanism to be worked out and applied which would ensure union republics' sovereign rights. The Leninist principles as the basis for both the socialist federalism and national relations to be reinstated. To return to the Leninist idea of the union of sovereign republics of equal rights, with the right to their own citizenship and a state language;

To raise considerably the standard of scientific interpretation and study of national relations, socialist internationalism, Soviet patriotism, national self-consciousness, and also of causes giving rise to manifestations of nationalism and chauvinism;

To compile long-term republican programs for the development of national processes and national relations and for regulating the demographic situation with the view to increasing the role of the indigenous population. The stands of these programes to be taken into consideration when planning any social and economic measures;

The development of the national culture to be considered of prime importance in union republics. The people of other nationalities residing in these union republics to be provided with necessary and equal conditions which would meet their cultural needs;

The prestige of education to be elevated in society. Stemming from the general demands for education, the union republics to be secured with the right to work out and implement teaching programs for schools which would take into account local characteristics, hostory, and national and cultural traditions;

The union republic's population to be raised in the spirit of internationalism and Soviet patriotism. Love for their home area to be shaped in all citizens of the republic, irrespective of nationality.

4. In the Democratization of State and Social Life [subhead]

The mass repressions during the period of personality cult (in 1941 and 1949 in Estonia) to be condemned as crimes against humanity;

The full power of the Soviets to be reinstated at all levels on their territory. A new election law to be worked out;

A nationwide referendum to be recognized as the highest form of expression of the people's will. A mechanism to be worked out for organizing referendums in respect of the most important questions in the socio-political and economic life of the state;

A commission to be set up at the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium with the participation of representatives of all union and autonomous republics, for the purpose of reconsidering the existing USSR Constitution and for the working out of a union agreement in the shape of a basic document for the union of equal Soviet republics. The union agreement to be prepared and discussed with the active participation of the public at large;

To conclude the shaping of the socialist lawful state. An effective public control to be created over the activity of all organs of law and order; total legal protection to be secured in the society for every citizen and his rights;

To adopt the stand that it falls under the jurisdiction of the USSR Supreme Soviet. To determine the general principles of legislation, whilst it falls under the jurisdiction of union republics to work out and adopt specific laws, with the aim of making management of the economy, of the social sphere and of utilization of nature, depending on local circumstances, more flexibly and diversely regulated legally. All-union laws must not be in contradiction with the constitutions of union republics;

To establish that in case of legislative contradiction between the union and the republics, it is the constitutional court at the USSR Supreme Soviet which will pass the final judgement upon the lawfulness of the USSR and Republics' normative documents in dispute. Representatives of all union republics must be included in the composition of the court on an equal basis;

Legal reform to be carried out to secure a person's legal defense in all stages of court proceedings;

The process of making available statistical information to be continued, restricting the availability of statistical indeces only on state security grounds;

To regard it as natural that under the conditions of democratizing social life, the growth in the political activity of workers and young people manifests itself in various movements in support of the development of socialism. To determine the status of forms of initiative manifested by social organizations and other citizens, and their legal safeguards for participation in the working out of the political course and the running of social and state matters. To involve them more widely over the working out and realization of important state resolutions;

To provide union republics with realistic opportunities for active participation in international life, for free communication with foreign countries, for representation in international organizations, for possessing, if there is a need, their own representations in neighboring countries and in countries with numerous emigrants of the same nationality.

5. In the Democratization of Internal Party Life [subhead]

To create safeguards for continuing the party's restructuring course, for developing democracy and openness, for a resolute denunciation of everything associated with the consequences of the personality cult, with stagnation, bureaucratic domineering in management, and with the infringement upon the Leninist norms of party and state life;

To determine realistically the functions of party, soviet, and state organs. To exercise party influence upon the activity of those organs via the communists working in them;

To increase the independence of all party links, to provide them with the opportunity to work out independently, according to local conditions, their specific organizational character and ideological situation, the tactics, forms and methods for resolving general party tasks, and to determine the size and composition of their own apparatus;

To achieve an increase in the role of elected party organs, to make the party apparatus rigorously subordinated to them and report to them; to reduce the numbers in the apparatus;

To create favorable conditions within the party for debate, for discussion of different views and standpoints, especially in cases of far-reaching resolutions being worked out;

To propose that theoretical foundations are worked out for the relationship of political pluralism existing within the party and the society;

To review the question of the status of the union republics' communist party central committees and determine their rights and duties and also the rights and duties of their members.

PRAVDA's Zhmirev on Restructuring

AU2906201188 [Editorial Report] The weekly Sofia POGLED in Bulgarian Issue No 26 on 27 June 1988, and the daily Sofia NARODNA MLADEZH in Bulgarian on 28 June both carry articles by Leonid Zhmirev, Moscow PRAVDA correspondent in Sofia, on the subjects of glasnost and restructuring in the Soviet Union, devoted to the forthcoming 19th CPSU All-Union Conference.

POGLED carries a 900-word article on page 8, entitled "Tributaries," which does not identify Zhmirev as a PRAVDA correspondent, but subtitles the article "Reflections of a Soviet Journalist on the Eve of the Conference."

Zhmirev points out that, if asked about the most exciting event in his life, he would answer without any hesitation: "Gorbachev's restructuring." He goes on criticizing the "stagnation of the Brezhnev era" and calls the system of those days "bureaucratic centralism." Referring at length to examples of bureaucracy in the days of the Tsarist regime appearing in Russian literary works from Tolstoy to Chekhov, where types of bureaucrats and ignorant civil servants are described in a satirical manner, the author compares Brezhnev's closest advisers—such as Shchelokov, Churbanov, and Brovinkov—to those types, stressing that they played the role of real "privy councillors" and were even more ignorant than those bureaucrats described in Chekhov's short story, "Promotion Examination" in which the hero is asked to name the tributaries of the River Ganges.

Zhmirev goes on praising Academician Sakharov as a "patriot believing in socialism" and says that in rereading a document compiled by Sakharov, Roy Medvedev, and V. Turchin 20 years ago, he finds a "condensed version of the Theses for the 19th CPSU Conference," adding: "The authors of this document wrote from the position of preserving and strengthening the Soviet socialist system, they submitted a draft on the democratization of society and expansion of glasnost." Zhmirev states: "I repeat that I am talking about a man, who quite recently was accused of "anti-Soviet activities" and labeled as a "slanderer."

Zhmirev further expresses his satisfaction that people like Yuriy Afanasiyev, Vitaliy Korotich, and Tatyana Zaslavska will attend the forthcoming conference, pointing out: "Boris Yeltsin, the one who 'has fallen into disgrace' will be at the conference as well. It is gratifiying that the opportunity and right of open discussion is restored in our party life. We all know that the former candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo has expressed his own opinion on the rate and scope of restructuring. Many people did not agree with him, they severely criticized him. Nevertheless, it is gratifying that the 'leftist' Yeltsin did not disappear from the scene, but is included in the group of delegates to the 19th CPSU Conference. This would have been impossible until recently."

Zhmirev goes on describing what he would not like about the forthcoming conference, namely that it should be turned into "a political show with loud applause, chanting of slogans, with drums and children's poems."

In conclusion Zhmirev states that Gorbachev, whom the majority of people views as a "symbol and guarantor of restructuring", "has not fallen from the skies," and is not "alone." He has predecessors and a "team," as well as "champions" who are fighting for restructuring. The author compares them to the "tributaries of the River Ganges," without which the river could not exist.

NARODNA MLADEZH on 28 June carries on pages 1 and 3, a 800-word article by Leonid Zhmirev, who is identified as "PRAVDA correspondent in our country", entitled "You Should Create Your Own Precedents," in which the author addresses Bulgarian youth with Lenin's words: "Let Us Study, Study, and Keep On Studying!" urging them to "oppose dogmatism" and to struggle for "pluralism of views." He points out the existence of a "dictatorship of precedents" in socialist society under which certain "party aparatchiks" are organizing groups of hired supporters who are supposed to interrupt the speeches of "high-ranking officials" with "stormy and prolonged applause." Zhmirev also criticizes the rituals of engaging young pioneers to beat drums, sing songs, and recite poems at party conferences, as well as the so-called "workers pledges and initiatives" dedicated to party congresses and other events, as unproductive.

Pointing out that "it is not easy," but nevertheless, exciting to be young in the era of restructuring, Zhmirev, on the occasion of the forthcoming 19th CPSU All-Union Conference, wishes Bulgarian youth that they may not rely on outdated traditions, but "create their own precedents."

Gorbachev Speech To Be Published as Book

LD0107063688 Moscow TASS in English 0620 GMT 1 Jul 88

[Text] Bonn July 1 TASS—The full text of the speech by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at the all-union party conference will be issued in the FRG in a separate book early in July. The book headlined "The Soviet Union's Future. Mikhail Gorbachev's Report" will be issued by the Cologne-based publishers "Pal-Rugenstein Verlag".

The second volume to be issued in a few weeks after the first one will be a collection of speeches by the conference delegates in the course of the discussions, the decisions of the party forum and world public reaction to the course of the all-union CPSU conference.

Delegate Wants 'Abolishment of Censorship'

PM2306161288 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 25, 19 Jun 88 pp 8-9

[Text] As a delegate to the Party Conference, I'm concerned with the internal problems of Party life since they are especially telling. Many grudges have accumulated in

the Party apparatus over the years which are now being revealed. This is a result, as I see it, of the profound dissatisfaction with the quality of our Party ranks. The selection of Party members was done by quota and according to the now outdated so-called class approach, which today is no longer in keeping with society's structure and level of consciousness. On top of that, when joining the Party, criteria which might seem old-fashioned and naive were not taken into account. For me they are the most important ones, though—the criteria of human decency. It is one thing to be familiar with the Party Programme and Rules, but purely personal characteristics like honour, dignity, feelings for people, patience and authority are another matter entirely.

It's no accident that over the last few decades I knew almost no major Party workers who could be called "peoples' favourites" or who were the embodiment of honour, selflessness and love for their people. Of course, there was Snieckus in Lithuania and Masherov in Belorussia, but they are the exceptions which prove the rule - there is a deficit of authoritative Party workers. It is an absolutely abnormal phenomenon for a leader not to leave a pleasant memory behind among the people. For example, since Korov's time we cannot name an individual as brilliant in Leningrad. Unfortunately, we're busy naming antiheroes like Bodyul and Rashidov. This is an extremely serious problem: the Party's strength and authority must be embodied by individuals.

Another important problem, I've been a Party member since 1942. I joined the Party in January, near Leningrad at the front. And ever since then, in spite of the fact that I strove to perform my Party duties well, no one even once asked my opinion about Party affairs. I never took part in the direct election of leaders. And I got used to the fact that Party leaders don't look at me, a rank-and-file Communist, but at the top. Because their career and work is not dependent on me, but on these "top floors." Hence the common feeling among rank-and-file Communists—"Nothing depends on me, I can't do anything"—which leads to apathy and indifference. It should be that those who are elected by us depend on each rank-and-file Party member, on his vote. In other words, we need direct elections both in the Party and in the Soviets.

Another delicate problem is getting out of the CPSU. I know people who don't want to be in the Party. Not for ideological reasons. They wish to leave the Party because of things like age, circumstances at home, but are afraid to say anything about it. After all, this is an extraordinary occurrence, and the former member will be looked on with suspicion. But this is undemocratic. A person must be able to freely decide the question of his membership in the Party. For example, during the period of stagnation, were there not people who were displeased with the state of affairs in their organization? This is really quite necessary, elementary. I think the Party would profit, too, by getting rid of some ballast. This right should be restored, but without any further unfavourable sanctions on the person.

We expect the main result of the 19th Conference to be simply that perestroika in all areas won't be undermined. As I see it, agriculture and the Food Programme are in a lot of hot water now. And this is felt by each and every Soviet person, since it's a problem of everyday life.

There are some problems that we aren't used to speaking about, like using opportunities and efforts carefully. During those hard times, when the whole country is standing in queues and constantly discovering that there is not enough of one thing and a deficit of something else, we must limit ourselves in something. Maybe in the launching of satellites and military spending, or by postponing some global economic projects.

The controversial dam in Leningrad is not only an ecological risk, but also inadmissible spending. The start of its grand construction was, economically speaking, not terribly timely.

Such decisions cannot be made at will, without nation-wide discussion.

Experience has shown that the decision on combatting alcoholism was not well thought out, the method chosen was wrong though the goal is an absolutely noble one. Even if the prices on spirits were to be cut right now, and there was more than enough available, it would be hard to change the situation, since moonshining is now an established practice.

What would I like to propose, based on my profession? To confirm and strengthen one of the most important gains of the glasnost period—the abolishment of censorship. This is one of the most important gains of our new, revolutionary life. More than that, all the things that are being published and talked about today, confirm how damaging it is when power interferes in art. What a tragic role such interferences played in the fate of our greatest geniuses in Stalin's times and during the stagnation period. The sad list of Yesenin, Mayakovskiy, Mandelshtam, Tsvetayeva, Akhmatova, Meyerkhold, Zoshchenko, Babel, Sholokhov—who kept silent in his final years—Shostakovich, and Lyubimov: they are all broken destinies, attacked not only by our obedient critics but also by the Party and powers that be.

And the alternative? I think, that we use our potential badly. We lived under Stalin's socialism. But there is a Leninist socialism which we knew theoretically, but under which we never managed to live. It is a fundamentally different socialism, and it incorporates a caring and respectful attitude towards culture and the arts. In my career as a writer, I don't remember that works got any better after the cultural department of a regional Party Committee interfered. Although I think and hope that in Leningrad, departments are staffed by more literate and civilized people than in other areas of the country. I'm a member of the editorial board of NEVA magazine. Aren't we capable of deciding ourselves what to print in

the magazine? We have been working without censorship and interference for three years now. Did we publish any anti-Soviet or counter-revolutionary works? No, quite the contrary: wonderful works, which enriched our culture, were printed during this time. How responsibly we handled the publication of V. Dudintsev's Robed in White, and soon we'll be printing Anatoliy Zlobin's novel Disassembly.

One more problem. How are non-Party people to be given an opportunity to take part in the political life of the country? They must not be excluded from Party affairs by a system of closed letters and meetings. Communists have no right to "go caste."

Must there be closed themes that exist for the Party alone? I don't see any reason for such a situation. Only Party members should be able to vote, but the discussions should be open to all.

I wouldn't like to have a "purge" of the Party, since this is a delicate matter that can harm people, lead to a settling of personal affairs, an unleashing of passions and cliquishness. As a rule, the timeservers and dodgers are not afraid of changes, they are politically safe and their futures are secure—they know the art of changing on command.

Unfortunately, Party work became a mere springboard to higher posts. And it doesn't matter whether a member has performed well in Party work or not—he qualifies for "good post" anyway. A tradition has formed whereby Party members are assigned the overwhelming majority of posts. And in their young years the healthy desire to make a good career forces people to join the Party not out of lofty sentiments—as it was at the front, before going into battle—but in order to climb up the ladder. I think that of all the editors of our central magazines, only one of them—Zalygin—is a non-Party man. All our newspaper editors are Party members. Why do our newspapers represent both the City Soviet and the City Party Committee? This isn't good. The tradition whereby an editor is approved at a conference or a congress should be restored. He should have some degree of independence. Only then will the press perform its functions.

Our Party and state are covered by a shell of bureaucracy, obsolescent circulars, instructions and norms, which have needed to be reviewed or abolished for a long time now.

A demonstration was recently held near Kazan Cathedral. It was held without permission and had a very controversial theme—the multi-party system. The militia broke it up, when it should have been Party workers who went and proved to the people, explained to them that they were wrong, to discuss and to debate. It is impossible to convince with the help of the militia. This is cowardice, and the inability to talk to the masses.

The secretaries of district Party committees must be the first to lead public discussions. It's no good being afraid of talking to crowds. Learning to talk is also a Party science.

Gorbachev Hears Blunt Talk From Delegates on Day 2 of Conference

Gorbachev (on press freedom) to M.A. Ulyanov: "...I even welcome the fact that you started this conversation.... If anyone of us feels hur, and we feel uncomfortable after something that is said—but it is truthful—then chew it over, go to the people, start trying to throw light on things.... Then our party will be living...."

M.A. Ulyanov to Gorbachev: "...Do you want there to be no mistakes—and indeed, making mistakes and insulting somebody or other (?belittles) all the press? Rather, as far as I understand you, you want to raise the level of the press, even if we make mistakes...."

V.P. Kapaidze, director-general of the Ivanovo Machine Tool Factory: "...Now I woud like to speak about the ministries. Speaking frankly..I do not need the ministry. We now manage qute well without it...."

V.I. Mironenko, first secretary of the Komsomol Central Committee: "Real participation of young people in the adoption of decisions affecting their vital interests must be ensured at all levels, from the labor collective to the USSR Supreme Soviet and the CPSU Central Committee."